



DOCTOR OF BUSINESS (DBA)

Entrepreneurialism driven from minor enclaves at The University of the West Indies, St Augustine Campus

Steele, Linda

Award date:
2008

Awarding institution:
University of Bath

[Link to publication](#)

Alternative formats

If you require this document in an alternative format, please contact:
openaccess@bath.ac.uk

Copyright of this thesis rests with the author. Access is subject to the above licence, if given. If no licence is specified above, original content in this thesis is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) Licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>). Any third-party copyright material present remains the property of its respective owner(s) and is licensed under its existing terms.

Take down policy

If you consider content within Bath's Research Portal to be in breach of UK law, please contact: openaccess@bath.ac.uk with the details. Your claim will be investigated and, where appropriate, the item will be removed from public view as soon as possible.

**Entrepreneurialism driven from minor enclaves at
The University of the West Indies, St Augustine Campus**

Linda Elizabeth Steele

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Business Administration
(Higher Education Management)

University of Bath
School of Management

July 2008

COPYRIGHT

Attention is drawn to the fact that copyright of this thesis rests with its author. This copy of the thesis has been supplied on condition that anyone who consults it is understood to recognize that its copyright rests with its author and that no quotation from the thesis and no information derived from it may be published without the prior written consent of the author.

This thesis may be made available for consultation within
The University Library and may be photocopied or lent to other libraries
for the purposes of consultation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	4
ABSTRACT	5
CHAPTERS	
1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND	6
2 LITERATURE REVIEW	18
3 METHODOLOGY	38
Research Design	40
Data Collection	48
Data Analysis	52
Validity, Reliability & Issues of Positionality and Ethics	53
4 FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES SUMMER PROGRAMME	63
Findings	63
Discussion	75
5 FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND EDUCATION SUMMER PROGRAMME	81
Findings	81
Discussion	88
6 FACULTY OF SCIENCE AND AGRICULTURE SUMMER PROGRAMME	94
Findings	94
Discussion	104
7 CONTINUING ENGINEERING EDUCATION CENTRE	110
Findings	110
Discussion	126
8 HEALTH ECONOMICS UNIT	132
Findings	132
Discussion	147
9 COMPARATIVE DISCUSSION	151
Reasons for birth and development of each unit	151
Barriers and/or challenges	155
Policy	161
Leadership	163

10	CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	167
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	172
	APPENDICES 1-15	178

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis was undertaken and completed with the extraordinary and unrelenting support of a number of persons.

I must first acknowledge, Godfrey, my husband, who insisted that I realize my dream of pursuing the DBA (HEM) degree in 2005, although we did not have a clue as to how the money for the remaining four installments of tuition fees would be obtained. His memorable words “If Jonathan, [our son] were alive, you would have spent money not yet earned on him” spurred me on. Godfrey’s financial, emotional and critical academic support (read this, it will help you with your thesis!) continued to the very end. I am truly thankful and indeed blessed to have him in my life.

I would like to express as well my gratitude and thanks to my supervisor, Professor Roger Dale for his strong, clear guidance and unwavering support over the last three years.

To all the interviewees thank you very much. Your interviews constituted a vital part of the data collection for this study.

I am convinced that this thesis would not have been completed in three years without the extraordinary support of Jo-Ann Georges, the Records Manager at the St. Augustine Campus. Her famous words “If it cannot be found, it means that we are not doing something right” were music in my ear. Every document, that I needed and requested was tracked down and eventually found by Jo-Ann. I am eternally grateful to her.

Heartfelt thanks as well to Mrs. Lylla Rose Bada, Campus Bursar and Mr. Jeremy Callaghan, Campus Registrar at the St. Augustine Campus, who convinced the rest of the University Management that I was deserving of financial help. This resulted in the University’s payment of the tuition fees for Phase II of the programme. I am grateful for the University’s support.

My thanks as well to the Director of Studies of the DBA (HEM) programme, Dr. Rajani Naidoo who has been always very kind and supportive. Thanks also to Jill Siddall and Lesa Cross, the DBA Administrators who always willingly and happily provided timely assistance whenever I requested same.

Finally, I would like to publicly express my thanks to my Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ who has been and continues to be always there for me. The statement “I can do all things through Christ who strengthens me” (Philippians 4:13 NKJV) kept me going when the going seemed rough.

ABSTRACT

ENTREPRENEURIALISM DRIVEN FROM MINOR ENCLAVES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF THE WEST INDIES, ST. AUGUSTINE CAMPUS

Clark (1998) argued that university transformation was not accidental or incidental and cannot happen as a result of the establishment of several innovative programmes within an organization. This view leads him to believe that such approaches can be sealed off as minor enclaves. This thesis ‘tests’ this claim through a study of entrepreneurialism within a traditional university, The University of the West Indies, St. Augustine Campus and challenges Clark’s argument by presenting evidence that ‘bottom up’ activities in a combination of units, rather than being limited to minor enclaves, were in fact involved in what can be seen as a bottom-up approach that drove entrepreneurialism at the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine Campus, Trinidad. As well, arising from the study, a ‘recipe’ for the transformation of traditional universities into entrepreneurial organizations was derived.

The body of the thesis is concerned with the investigations carried out into the entrepreneurial activities of five units within the institution. Key personnel from each of the five ‘enclaves’ were interviewed and a textual analysis of relevant historical data was undertaken. Presented in chapters one, two and three of the thesis are the introduction and background to the study, the literature review and the methodology. The findings and discussion of each unit are presented separately in chapters four to eight, while chapter nine is a comparative chapter of the five units based on identified themes, which were generated from the four research questions. The conclusion and recommendations based on the overall findings and discussions are presented in chapter 10.

ENTREPRENEURIALISM DRIVEN FROM MINOR ENCLAVES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF THE WEST INDIES, ST. AUGUSTINE CAMPUS

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Global changes have been taking place with respect to higher education. Their radical nature and the breadth of their spread have forced institutions in the developed world to find innovative ways of dealing with these rapid changes. A contributing factor to the changes is the issue of globalization and internationalization. Rinne and Koivula (2005, p. 92) advocated that because of the pressures of globalization “universities have to balance between two extremes: traditional academic culture and market culture”. Clark (1998) advocated that in this era of globalization, in order for universities to be successful, traditional values and the new culture of higher education had to be combined. The European knowledge society has been advocated as an answer to globalization in that part of the world. The concept of globalization has had varying effects on universities in the periphery, but even more so, on the more traditional of them. This thesis looks at the impact of globalization on higher education on one such traditional university in the developing world, The University of the West Indies, St. Augustine Campus and in particular how it adjusts to one frequently highlighted aspect of the changes brought about by globalization, namely entrepreneurialism. Beyond this though, the thesis is structured around an argument that questions what may be becoming one of the standard assumptions of entrepreneurial universities, Burton Clark’s (1998, p. 4) argument that the transformation to entrepreneurialism:

occurs when a number of individuals come together in university basic units and across a university over a number of years to change, by means of organized initiative, how the institution is structured and oriented.

In other words, Clark (1998) advocates a top-down, rather than a bottom-up approach, for successful entrepreneurial transformation within universities. In

fact, he dismissed innovative programmes within universities as merely minor enclaves. This thesis, then, attempts to register the impact of globalization on The University of the West Indies, St. Augustine, in particular, through the medium of an extended discussion of the validity of Clark's (1998) enclaves claim.

The University of the West Indies (UWI) is an autonomous regional institution funded by fifteen Caribbean countries – Anguilla, Antigua & Barbuda, the Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Dominica, Grenada, Jamaica, Montserrat, St. Christopher & Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent & the Grenadines, and the Republic of Trinidad & Tobago.

The University began in 1948 at the Mona Campus in Jamaica, as a University College, based on a special arrangement with the University of London. Two other campuses were started in 1960 at St. Augustine, Trinidad, Republic of Trinidad & Tobago (formerly the Imperial College of Tropical Agriculture), and 1963 at Cave Hill in Barbados (University of the West Indies, 2004). The UWI which celebrated its 60th anniversary in 2008 achieved university status in 1962 under the Great Seal of the Realm, with Princess Alice, Countess of Athlone, as the first Chancellor and Sir Arthur Lewis as the first Vice Chancellor (The Pelican, January-June 2008).

The Principal Officers of the University are the Chancellor, the Vice Chancellor, and eight Pro-Vice-Chancellors of which three are Campus Principals. There are three Deputy Campus Principals, a University Registrar, a University Bursar and a University Librarian. The Campus Principals are the principal officers on each of the three campuses. Each Principal is supported by a Campus Registrar, a Campus Bursar and a Campus Librarian.

The University of the West Indies is run on the Committees and Boards system which it inherited from the University of London, which by its very nature results in a slow decision-making process. However, based on a review of the literature, the consensus is that traditional universities like the University of the West Indies must be transformed into entrepreneurial organizations in order to meet the challenges of the twenty-first century.

The University's first strategic plan spanned the period 1997-2002. Four major goals were emphasized but it is the fourth goal that is relevant to this thesis. It goes as follows:

- to make the University more financially self-reliant by improving cost-effectiveness and by using available human resources and physical assets to increase earned income and to compete effectively for grant funding.

A review of the first strategic plan with respect to goal number 4 under the heading "Diversification of Income Services" read in part:

The Summer School programme offerings were expanded quite substantially on all campuses, and succeeded in attracting large numbers of students each year. In some cases, the primary enrolment source consisted of students already enrolled in degree programmes. These students were motivated by the desire to accelerate completion of their programmes or repeat courses they had failed. Some students pursuing cross-faculty combinations also found it easier to overcome timetable clashes or gain admission to courses in high demand. However, many Summer School programmes also succeeded in attracting persons from outside the University, including international students registered at other universities (Strategic Plan II – 2002-2007 [Updated March, 2003]).

While the University of the West Indies was celebrating the Summer Programmes and the fact that international students were accessing the courses, the findings of this study will reveal the many barriers, obstacles and challenges that the first summer programme, which was the brainchild of the then Deputy Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences, St. Augustine faced and how he overcame them.

The second strategic plan emphasized the attainment of nine strategic objectives for the period 2002-2007 among them strengthening the university's finances. One of the twelve ways of doing so included the following:

- Pursue further diversification of income sources through business operations, full-fee academic programmes, institutional consultancies, technical services, intellectual property income, partnership agreements, etc

It means, therefore, that the University of the West Indies, moved a step further in 2002 to setting objectives that included the setting up of business operations on the three campuses. By 2008, the University of the West Indies was in its first year of its third strategic plan for the period 2007-2012 and “Funding the Enterprise” is one of the major goals of the plan.

Before the advent of the first strategic plan in 1997, the Continuing Engineering Education Centre, in 1986 embarked on an entrepreneurial journey led by Prof. CI and six years later, in 1992 the Faculty of Social Sciences Summer Programme came into being as a result of the foresight and entrepreneurial spirit of Dr. PK, the then Deputy Dean (Student Matters) in the Faculty. These two programmes, along with two other Summer Programmes in the Faculty of Humanities and Education and the Faculty of Science and Agriculture and the birth of the Health Economics Unit, by their entrepreneurial action, structure and attitude played a major role in the transformation that has been taking place at the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine Campus.

This brief account seems, on the face of it, to contradict Burton Clark’s (1998, p. 4) view that:

University transformation, for the most part, is not accidental or incidental. It does not happen because several innovative programs are established here and there within a university: the new approaches can be readily sealed off as minor enclaves.

Clark, therefore, is of the view that a proliferation of enclaves, no matter how many, cannot lead to university transformation. As far as he is concerned,

entrepreneurialism within a traditional university, like the University of the West Indies, cannot be built from minor enclaves.

Clark's (1998) model, despite some criticism, has dominated the literature on the entrepreneurial university. However, my experience with the Faculty of Social Sciences Summer Programme led me to question his enclave statement and I decided to investigate whether or not his assumption was correct, thus setting this thesis in motion.

A clearer understanding of the term *enclave* was first sought from the existing literature and as advocated for any empirical study, a review of the literature of the entrepreneurial university was undertaken. Since chapter two deals specifically with that review, I think it will be useful to discuss the enclave issue at this point.

The term *enclave* refers to ethnic, racial, cultural or economic sub-groups. These groups are thought to exist within a larger social system but do not have an impact on the larger system. They are characterized by in-group solidarity, and a tendency to depend on their survival and success by relying on local social networks or communal resources for mobility (Silverman, 1999; Logan et al, 2002; Portes & Zhou, 1993). For example, Kwong (1997) describes the existence of ethnic enclaves that use ethnic solidarity to exert control over co-ethnic employees. Kwong challenged the ethnic enclave thesis by asserting that it can serve to block the efforts of new immigrants seeking to establish themselves outside of their ethnic environment in New York's Chinatown.

Apart from solidarity, another characteristic of enclaves is their like-mindedness or commonality of thinking (Weber, 2003). Like-mindedness among enclaves suggests a similarity of thinking, especially about the entrepreneurial activity, but it is not clear whether such like-mindedness is confined to members of an enclave or whether it extends to like-mindedness across different enclaves or similar enclaves in the same larger organizational setting.

In general terms, the potential impact of an enclave, even a minor enclave, is limited (Clark, 1998). Enclaves, if they exist, and are expected to have any impact on a larger entrepreneurial context such as a host organization would be described as a bottom-up approach to entrepreneurialism, rather than a top-down framework of organizational change and transformation. However, the possibility of an integration of top-down and bottom-up approaches was explored in the context of local-global partnerships in Canada and Australia (Parker, 2001).

Minor enclaves in entrepreneurship are not usually associated with Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), but within the context of organizational theory, it is possible to explore their role as a sub-group or as a cluster or unit within a larger organization. Ackroyd (1996), for example, describes transformation among newer professional industries [of which HEI may be considered one type, I assert] as challenging but capable of being developed around “encapsulated professional groups”.

Contemporary management of professional services is not without difficulty in these circumstances; and, in areas where professions are well-established, re-organization is taking place round encapsulated professional groups rather than by re-considering them.

It may be quite possible that minor enclaves are becoming part of a newer approach to management and leadership that requires a new way of looking at their potential role in organizational change and transformation. In the context of HEIs this may mean that minor enclaves can have the potential to drive entrepreneurialism from the bottom-up, or from an integrated top-down and bottom-up approach. If minor enclaves are able to do so, then they present a challenge to Clark’s view that they cannot and should be readily sealed-off. Thus, this study seeks to challenge Clark’s argument by presenting a countervailing view that a combination of units, rather than being limited to minor enclaves, can in fact be involved in a bottom-up approach that drives entrepreneurialism at the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine Campus.

In brief, the argument to be elaborated through the analysis of those activities is that a more entrepreneurial culture now pervades the campus. The benefits of entrepreneurialism can be seen in a tangible way (the three faculty Summer Programmes and the Health Economics Unit, in particular) so many more people have become interested in the concept. Since rules had to be changed in an ad hoc manner to facilitate the entrepreneurial units, the inflexible and old-fashioned governance has been questioned and inroads have been made in the breaking down of the traditional way of managing the university. With respect to the funding and resource aspect of the St. Augustine Campus, the ability of the Faculties of Engineering, Social Sciences and Science and Agriculture to provide funding not only for recurring expenditure but for capital expenses has certainly opened the University management's eyes to the benefits associated with the University making and spending of its own money. However, not much headway has been made with respect to formalizing a reward and compensation system associated with an entrepreneurial university.

The following research questions were initially formulated based on the literature reviewed.

- 1 Was the Summer Programme recognized as an entrepreneurial unit in its early years and was it intended to be an entrepreneurial unit?
- 2 Were there barriers/obstacles in the creation of an entrepreneurial unit within a traditional university?
- 3 What is the relationship between an entrepreneurial unit within a traditional university and policy formulation?
- 4 Does leadership play a role in driving entrepreneurialism from a minor enclave?

A pilot study was first undertaken, using the case of the Faculty of Social Sciences Summer Programme. The findings appeared to challenge Clark's assumption and a larger study, based on five cases of 'bottom-up' entrepreneurial activity from different 'enclaves' across the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine, was set up. The research questions were eventually modified to suit the bigger study of the five cases. Documentary evidence and interviews of the

key persons associated with each unit were conducted and then a comparative study of the five case studies, based on themes generated from the research questions, was completed. The structure of the thesis follows the textbook presentation of any empirical study. Following this introductory chapter, chapter 1, the review of the literature will be presented in chapter 2 and the methodology in chapter 3. The findings and discussion of each case study will be presented in separate chapters i.e. chapters 4 to 8. The comparative case study alluded to above will be presented in chapter 9 and concluding statements and recommendations will follow in chapter 10. It should be pointed out here that a great deal of administrative detail was provided for each case study in order to demonstrate how the traditional organization, The University of the West Indies, St. Augustine, adjusted to the business principles that became necessary as a result of the entrepreneurial activity that took place over the transforming years.

In order to provide background information on the five units that were investigated a synopsis of each of the five units on the St. Augustine Campus namely, the Faculty of Social Sciences Summer Programme, the Faculty of Science and Agriculture Summer Programme, the Faculty of Humanities and Education Summer Programme, the Continuing Engineering Education Centre and the Health Economics Unit is presented in this introductory chapter.

CASE OF THE FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES SUMMER PROGRAMME

In 1991, the year-long teaching system was abolished and the semester system was implemented. Supplemental examinations, a feature of the year-long system, were discontinued initially in the Faculty of Social Sciences, which is one of five faculties at the St. Augustine Campus and one of three cross-campus faculties. In March 1992, the Deputy Dean (Student Matters) of the Faculty of Social Sciences, St. Augustine presented a proposal for the establishment of a Faculty Summer Programme to provide an opportunity for students to repeat courses that they had failed during the semesters, to the Campus Board, Faculty of Social Sciences. Approval for the proposal was sought and eventually granted by the various Boards and Committees in the university system. The programme began in the summer of 1992. It has been and continues to be a huge success in terms of

providing access to students who could not gain a place in the Faculty, simply because demand outweighed supply, in providing an opportunity for students to repeat failed courses or accelerate their progress, and in providing an additional source of income for the Faculty.

The programme, which is now considered the entrepreneurial arm of the Faculty of Social Sciences, was initially considered by many key university personnel to be a short-term programme to meet a specific need. However, under the leadership of the Deputy Dean (Student Matters), it did only flourish but its very existence led to the formulation of new policy throughout the University system.

The Faculty is now in the enviable position of reaping the benefits of an additional and independent source of income. It is now more business-like in its operations and the rest of the University community has taken and continues to take note of the impact that the programme has made on the operations of the University of the West Indies.

CASE OF THE FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND EDUCATION SUMMER PROGRAMME

The Summer Programme of the Faculty of Humanities and Education began in 1998. The official reason for the establishment of the programme was to facilitate throughput and to give students an opportunity to recover from failure. Like Social Sciences, this Faculty discontinued supplemental examinations when the semester system was implemented in 1991. However, the then Dean of the Faculty confessed that the Faculty was envious of the kinds of returns that it saw coming to the Faculty of Social Sciences which was reaping the benefits of having surpluses as a result of its summer programme. The Humanities part of the Faculty actually shares the building that houses the Faculty of Social Sciences.

The Humanities and Education Programme developed quite rapidly over the first five years of its existence. This programme benefited by having the Social Sciences programme as its forerunner, since it did not have to face and deal with some of the challenges and barriers that confronted the Faculty of Social Sciences during the early years of that programme. Like Social Sciences its programme is

also considered the entrepreneurial arm of the Faculty. As well, the income from the programme was more than welcome during those first five years since it coincided with the period when the funding from the Government of Trinidad and Tobago was not up to date.

CASE OF THE FACULTY OF SCIENCE AND AGRICULTURE SUMMER PROGRAMME

The Faculty of Natural Sciences and the Faculty of Agriculture were joined in 1996. The combined faculties initially became known as the Faculty of Agriculture and Natural Sciences. It is now called the Faculty of Science and Agriculture. This programme, therefore, had to deal with challenges associated with the merger of the two faculties e.g. rules and regulations, norms, culture. In the case of the Faculty of Agriculture, it continued to offer supplemental examinations to all its students while the Faculty of Natural Sciences offered supplemental examinations only to Year 1 students. Although the Faculty of Agriculture began a long vacation programme as far back as 1988 to facilitate students who had failed courses, it was simply to prepare students in a systematic way for the supplemental examinations that were offered in its faculty. Evidence will show that the administration expected that programme to cover all costs, but not to make a profit of any kind. In the case of the Faculty of Natural Sciences whose programme began in 1993, the summer programme was more attractive to its students since the second-year and third-year students did not have the benefit of supplemental examinations. In addition to covering all costs, the Science and Agriculture summer programme met the administration's new mandate that the programme should not only break-even but should also generate income. The income was used to supplement the funding provided by the government. This Faculty's summer programme also became the entrepreneurial arm of the Faculty of Science and Agriculture. It should be noted, as well, that this summer programme also benefited from having the Social Sciences summer programme as a forerunner to its own programme.

CASE OF THE CONTINUING ENGINEERING EDUCATION CENTRE

The Continuing Engineering Education Centre was initially known as the Continuing Education Committee. This Committee started its operation in 1973 and continued to run five or six courses per year as a means of providing continuing engineering education for engineers in Trinidad and Tobago. However, when Prof. CI took over the chairmanship of the Committee in 1986, the programme was transformed into a more business-like operation. Recognizing that there was a market for continuing engineering courses, Prof CI was instrumental in increasing the number of courses that were offered from five to twenty during the first five years while he led the programme. This programme not only satisfied a need, but it was also able to provide plant and equipment for the Faculty of Engineering from surpluses generated. This programme, as well, became the entrepreneurial arm of the Faculty of Engineering. It should be noted, that the period of growth and development of the Continuing Engineering Committee coincided with the period when the Trinidad and Tobago Government was lagging in its funding for the University of the West Indies.

The Continuing Education Committee was later renamed the Continuing Engineering Education Centre. As indicated above, the Centre was led and managed by Prof. CI who withstood numerous challenges and barriers to the businesslike manner in which he conducted the affairs of the Centre. The operations of the Centre were so successful that it eventually provided courses for engineers not only in Trinidad and Tobago but for engineers in other Caribbean countries. The Centre became the backbone of the Engineering Institute which was launched in September 1994 in Trinidad and in April 1995 in Jamaica.

CASE OF THE HEALTH ECONOMICS UNIT

The Health Economics Unit came into being in 1995. It was established in response to what the Coordinator, Prof. KT saw as a need in the region for sound policy advice with respect to health economic issues and so he decided to do something about it. He took the risky decision of taking a team of five recently graduated M.Sc students on his first major assignment outside of Trinidad and Tobago. That decision not only led to the production of good work, but culminated in the acceptance of the Health Economics Unit as the first port of call

for that type of work in the region by international bodies like the Pan American Health Organization and the World Health Organization.

This unit did not suffer the many barriers that the other entrepreneurial units endured, but was challenged by the fact that it had to survive without having any established university posts. Through the efforts of the Coordinator, the Government of Trinidad and Tobago eventually agreed to provide funds for academic posts, possibly because it has accepted the fact that the unit has been, and with support, can continue to provide vital health economic policy support in the region. It has now become so successful in its operations that the World Bank and the Government of Trinidad and Tobago have both agreed to provide capital funds for the establishment of a building to house the Unit and to facilitate training of Health Economics personnel in the region.

In summary, therefore, the main purpose of this thesis is to investigate whether Clark's assumption that entrepreneurialism cannot be driven from minor enclaves and should be readily sealed-off was a correct assumption. The secondary purpose, if his assumption is successfully challenged, is to put forward a recipe for the transformation of traditional universities into entrepreneurial organizations. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, the literature review will be presented in Chapter 2 and the methodology in chapter 3. Since five cases are involved, the findings and discussion of each case will be presented separately in chapters 4 to 8. Chapter 9 will focus on a comparison of the five cases using themes generated from the four research questions. Concluding statements and recommendations will be presented in chapter 10.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The major theoretical focus of this dissertation is the entrepreneurial university, and the major research questions cluster around the degree to which St. Augustine is an example of an entrepreneurial university. While the discussion focuses on one particular element of entrepreneurial universities—the status, nature and consequences of ‘enclaves’ within them, that specific focus has to be informed by and placed in the context of the wider conception of the entrepreneurial university. Consequently, the focus of this chapter is a review of the literature of the entrepreneurial university. One central argument is to demonstrate change in the nature of the St. Augustine Campus from being ‘traditional’ to becoming ‘entrepreneurial’ as a result of the activities of the units that were investigated. In order to do that, it is first necessary to know what an entrepreneurial university *is*, and hence the focus of the literature review, is to consider the relevant literature with the aim of establishing some criteria that will enable us to judge how far St. Augustine can be seen as an entrepreneurial university. Particular attention will be paid to the development of the phenomenon, its characteristics and the pressures on universities to transform themselves into entrepreneurial universities as advocated by Clark (1998). Critics of Clark’s model will be acknowledged and possible alternatives to the entrepreneurial university will be identified. However, the literature demonstrates that although the concept of the entrepreneurial university has been called by different names, the consensus appears to be that universities, especially traditional ones, must embrace the entrepreneurial culture in some form in their efforts to ensure survival in the twenty-first century.

Since the case studies are all units within the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine, seen as historically a traditional university, the literature outlining the factors that inhibit entrepreneurial habits in traditional universities will be reviewed as well. Strategically, my aim in this chapter will be to establish how far The University of the West Indies, St. Augustine Campus meets the criteria of an entrepreneurial university. In doing so, the chapter will adopt a particular focus on literature with respect to change and leadership versus management given that the entrepreneurial university literature highlights the reaction to change and the

value of leadership in the process of moving from a traditional to an entrepreneurial university. A major aim of this chapter, then, is to consider how far The University of the West Indies, St. Augustine meets the criteria of an entrepreneurial university.

“The *entrepreneurial university* has many definitions, but generally it means entrepreneurial action, structures and attitude in a university” (Rinne & Koivula, 2005, p. 103). Although the entrepreneurial university was developed from the grassroots level in the late 1800s in the United States of America (Rinne & Koivula, p. 104), it was not until the last quarter of the twentieth century that European Universities became interested in the phenomenon. In the autumn of 1985 twelve senior university administrators from six European countries visited the United States of America to “study the phenomenon and development of the entrepreneurial university” (Davies, 1987, p. 12).

Davies explained that while the traditional role of European Universities was teaching and research which dealt with the discovery, production and dissemination of knowledge, the American tradition incorporated a third dimension, public service, and in performing that third role, entrepreneurial and adaptive behaviour surfaced. He further explained that adaptive behaviour constituted the university’s ability to scan the environment and adjust to keep pace with the changes that were taking place while the entrepreneurial behaviour constituted the imposing of a business model on the adaptive core.

American Universities that placed a strong emphasis on adaptive and entrepreneurial behaviour became known as entrepreneurial universities and examples of adaptive and entrepreneurial activities in such universities were noted and highlighted in the report arising from the study tour. These included continuing education, research and technology transfer, industry-university relations and fund raising (Davies, 1987). In addition to these examples of adaptive and entrepreneurial activities, an interesting question arose: what were the factors that led to the putting of greater emphasis on entrepreneurial adaptive behaviour which eventually led to the spread of entrepreneurial activity in higher education institutions?

Davies (1987) identified factors which at that time seemed to be the reason why more US universities were shifting towards the adaptive/entrepreneurial style of operation. He suggested demographic trends - the number of part-time students over 25 years of age was rising, the financial downturn in the economy, the emerging severely competitive market and the fact that the focus of university relationships with industry was becoming fashionable. This view was supported by Boyer who, in delivering the feature address at the Institutional Management in Higher Education Programme conference in September 1986, concluded that the American system of higher education was “searching for ways to adjust to major new forces that call for realignment” (Boyer, 1987, p. 5). He went on to identify five powerful trends that were shaping American higher education, namely the shifting structure (the composition of the student body), the troubled profession (faculty), the emergence of corporate research, the impact of technology and the manner in which success was measured.

With respect to European countries and institutions, Davies (1987) argued that the notion of the adaptive, innovative and entrepreneurial higher education institution was of interest to them because of the “challenges posed by a quickly changing and turbulent political, social and economic environment, which casts questions on such factors as the relevance of the relationship between institutions and the consumers of university teaching, research and other services (notably industry); the adequacy of existing financial resources; the appropriateness of existing provisions for a potentially large adult and continuing education population; and the general ability of universities to defend their positions and respond positively to changing conditions” (Davies, 1987, p. 12).

Clark (1998, p. xiii), in referring to the world wide turbulence with respect to higher education institutions, noted that “the universities of the world have entered a time of disquieting turmoil that has no end in sight”. That assumption was based on what he identified as the difficulties faced by universities all over the world during the last quarter of the twentieth century, namely the diverse student body, the quest for continuous repeated education and the need for universities to provide competent graduates to satisfy the growing number of knowledge-based enterprises. These challenges were quite similar to the concern

with changing trends in the student body identified by Boyer (1987). Additionally, governments expected universities to help in the solving of social and economic problems although funding from the said governments was reduced. How then were universities to survive in the first place, and second, provide all that was now expected of them? Adopting the entrepreneurial mode of operation seemed to provide relief for those who had adopted that approach.

Davies (1987, p. 15) described the tension between the two traditions with respect to Universities. He identified “a basic tension between the traditional purpose of the University and some latter day imperatives to stability and survival”. He further advised that the development of the Entrepreneurial and Adaptive University was the coming together of two traditions: the Providing tradition (of which the dominant operating metaphors are Collegiality, Bureaucracy, and Organized Anarchy) and the Client/Consumer tradition (of which the dominant operating metaphors are Consumerism, Business and Public Accountability). Universities could reconcile this tension by adopting a third symbiotic tradition whose dominant operating metaphors are Strategic Planning, Political Accommodation and Ethical Codes (Davies & Morgan, 1981).

Davies (1987) argued that the entrepreneurial adaptive university was an entity that was attempting to satisfy several objectives at the same time, namely, basic research, applied research and development, conventional graduate and postgraduate education and continuing education. In order to achieve each objective, he suggested the university’s doing away with the traditional bureaucratic organizational structure and the university’s adoption of a differentiated suitable organizational structure to effectively carry out its goals. To this end the study group developed “some basic propositions on strategies for managing the process of changing a university from being an institution where EAU (Entrepreneurial Adaptive University) activities are rather peripheral, to one where EAU business is thoroughly institutionalized” (Davies, 1987, p. 85).

However, Clark’s (1998) model has more or less set the terms of the entrepreneurial university debate in Europe (Shattock, 2005, p. 17) and his model has become the accepted dominant model as demonstrated later in this chapter

(Kristensen, 1999; Marginson & Considine, 2000; Pavlowski, 2001; Lazzeroni & Piccaluga, 2003; Schulte, 2004; Rinne & Koivula, 2005; Shattock, 2003).

Smith (1999) and Deem (2001) in their respective critiques of his model argued that only a selection of senior staff were interviewed by Clark and as such the entrepreneurial culture may not have been embodied by all members of staff. Empirical data to support their criticism were provided by Finlay (2004, p. 417), whose study of one of the universities used in developing Clark's model, confirmed that there was "only one range of views held within the University in which there are a variety of cultures operating". Additionally, with respect to Clark's proposition that all universities should follow the entrepreneurial route, Deem (2001, p. 16) concluded that although Clark "seems to reinforce the message that international and global forces are pushing all universities down a similar road to the five [universities] studied", local factors affecting higher education institutions may have been under-emphasized. Soares and Amaral (1999, p. 17)) argued that while one may be tempted to use Clark's pathways as a recipe for good university practice they noted that it may not be possible because of the type and size of the universities studied. They concluded that "the difficulties in overcoming internal opposition were certainly less strong than in the older established comprehensive universities".

Another criticism of Clark's model was that he did not outline how traditional universities should go about transforming themselves. Wasser (2001, p. 509) thought that the 1998 book was "ultimately disappointing" and argued that the five case studies were not traditional universities that were transformed into entrepreneurial universities. He further argued that the subtitle "Organizational Pathways of Transformation" led one to believe that the recipe for the difficult task of transforming old, traditional universities would have been found in the book but what was actually dished out was "the easier mission of upgrading institutes".

Arguments against universities adopting commercial behaviour also surfaced. Barry Chambers (1999) supported the idea of an entrepreneurial university but he was of the view that entrepreneurship in an educational institution was not strictly

commercial. He described how the American University of Bulgaria at Blagoevgrad became successful based on educational entrepreneurship by offering a curriculum unique to the Bulgarian higher education environment and by empowering staff with a strong commitment to the institution. Deem (2001, p. 7) suggested that while “globalization is a fashionable stance” one must be extremely careful in applying it to education. Subotzky (1999, p. 401) conceded that globalization had significantly altered patterns of production and research and development which, in turn, had generated new organisational forms and practices in higher education resulting in a strong trend towards the entrepreneurial university with its market-like behaviour and governance. In order to maintain “higher education’s contribution to equity, community development and the public good”, Subotzky identified “the higher education partnership model as a complementary alternative to the entrepreneurial university” based on South African higher education. As far as entrepreneurialism and traditional universities are concerned Tuunainen (2005, p. 202) argued that “the traditional university is not being transformed into an entrepreneurial one as straightforwardly as claimed by Henry Etzkowitz”. Armbruster (2008) went a step further. He argued that the “entrepreneurial university is a failed idea” and presented a broader research programme on university autonomy and finance.

Despite the criticism of both Clark’s model and the entrepreneurial university in general, what is clear is that a new kind of higher education institution is emerging and that “Clark’s picture of the Entrepreneurial University (Clark, 1998) has achieved iconic status amongst university models for the twenty-first century” (Shattock, 2003, p. 146). Kristensen (1999), Marginson & Considine (2000), Pavlowski (2001), Lazzeroni & Piccaluga (2003), Schulte (2004), Rinne & Koivula (2005) and Shattock (2003) have all contributed to the literature with respect to this new entity but while the title of the emerging phenomenon varies, the concepts are very similar. Kristensen (1999) saw the entrepreneurial university as a learning university and showed how the Copenhagen Business School “increased its capacity for change through strategic management and management of quality” (p. 35). Marginson & Considine (2000) outlined the power, governance and reinvention of Australian universities and termed the emerging phenomenon the enterprise university as opposed to the entrepreneurial university

or the corporate university since “‘enterprise’ captures both economic and academic dimensions” (p. 5). They showed how different *kinds* of universities responded to the entrepreneurial concept.

One practical example of the response to the entrepreneurial concept led to further analysis. Pawlowski (2001) described how a private business school became one of the most successful entrepreneurial higher education institutions in Poland in ten years and the institutional plans that were in train to ensure that the school remained top of the line. He saw the efforts as a movement towards the school becoming an entrepreneurial university. The emergence of schools like the Polish private business school led Lazzeroni and Piccaluga (2003) to analyze the emergence and evolution of schools and universities in the education system in Europe that were heading towards a more entrepreneurial model, while Schulte (2004) who saw the entrepreneurial university as a strategy for institutional development, argued that the “entrepreneurial university will contribute to the development of its region, and through cooperation with other entities, to economic development in general” (p. 187).

Rinne and Koivula (2005) in a review of the literature with respect to the Entrepreneurial University in the European Knowledge Society concluded that universities were faced with new demands from their many stakeholders, market ideology was creeping into the public sector and there was a continued alteration in the relationship between the state and the university. Universities simply had to find a way to deal with new situations. As far as the market ideology is concerned, Webster (2003) highlighted the fact that based on the demands from the various stakeholders, higher education institutions have embraced the market discourse. He pointed out that higher education literature was now replete with “language, symbolism and metaphors of popular business management”. Words like “best practice” “list of indicators (benchmarks)”, “effective investment” and “long term returns” now form part of the vocabulary of managers and administrators of higher education institutions. Shattock (2003) is very much in favour of entrepreneurial behaviour among universities but in an academic sense. Rinne and Koivula (p. 112) summed up his thinking this way: “The Universities should function in an entrepreneurial fashion, but in an academic sense, not in an

economic sense. Economic success will be a result of academic success, but the opposite is not necessarily true”.

However, Shattock (2003) is very much aware of the factors that inhibited entrepreneurial behaviour in traditional universities. Movement from the traditional role of the university to one in which it can stand on its own and is both adaptive and innovative is more challenging for traditional universities than for new higher education institutions. While Davies (1987) identified inhibiting factors in three broad areas, namely, government-university relationships, financial management practices and personnel policies and practices, Shattock (2003) identified similar intrinsic inhibitions. He argued that the role of the state, organizational culture and tradition, structures that impose layers of authority between the operating units, academic departments, and the strategic centre and the lack of a strengthened steering core are all elements that in some way obstruct universities in their quest to become entrepreneurial.

The enormity of the many barriers and obstacles faced by universities in their quest to become entrepreneurial was highlighted by Lambert (2006) who generated quite an extensive list of impediments, inhibitors and barriers to university entrepreneurialism from the case studies in the European Universities for Entrepreneurship: their role in the Europe of Knowledge (EUEREK) project. These can be classified under four main headings. The first category relates to *cultural issues* such as a strong academic excellence tradition, a lack of interest in money making, a higher status accorded to academic work over entrepreneurial projects, and little interest in/hunger for risk taking and entrepreneurship. The second category concerns *structural issues* such as old fashioned and inflexible governance, and poor leadership continuity. The third category constitutes *funding and resource issues* such as lack of control of tuition cost, dependency on state funding, low liquidity damper on risk taking and lack of support e.g. project managers for innovative work. The fourth category consists of *issues relating to reward and compensation* for entrepreneurial work such as lack of recognition in assessment and promotion, pay incentives (rigid compensation packages especially in unionized environments). However, Lambert noted, based on a survey of the most important inhibitors to university entrepreneurialism, that

entrepreneurialism was not part of an academic's career assessment. Like all traditional universities, the University of the West Indies appeared at the outset of this study to be faced with similar challenges. The full extent to which they were in fact present at St. Augustine prior to this study is addressed in the findings reported later.

Despite the many barriers confronting universities in their quest to becoming entrepreneurial, the concept of the entrepreneurial university has taken root in many regions of the world. Etzkowitz et al (2000) argued that based on comparative evidence that they had unearthed, a pattern of transformation toward an entrepreneurial university was emerging from different areas in the world namely, the United States, Latin America, Europe and Asia. That led them to conclude that it appeared "that the entrepreneurial university is a global phenomenon with an isomorphic developmental path, despite different starting points and modes of expression (p. 313). There is evidence of the continued spread of this global phenomenon in Denmark, Poland, Chile, Japan, Serbia, Singapore and Newcastle in the United Kingdom (Kristensen, 1999; Pawlowski, 2001; Bernasconi, 2005; Yokoyama, 2006; Stankovic, 2006; Wong, Ho & Singh, 2007; and Benneworth; 2007). Additionally, Italian universities are trying to adopt an entrepreneurial approach as a means of facing the new competitive scenario in the higher education environment (Petrizzellis, D'Uggento & Romanazzi, 2006). It can be seen, therefore, that countries in different parts of the globe have been adopting the entrepreneurial route albeit from the top-down approach. The units described in chapter one seem to be adopting the entrepreneurial spirit. However, I shall attempt to show in the following chapters that although these units are pursuing similar objectives they appear to be doing so from a bottom-up approach rather than a top-down approach as obtains elsewhere.

Neal (1998) raised the question of quality assurance in the entrepreneurial university. He noted that while the traditional higher education community viewed the idea of an entrepreneurial university as an oxymoron, the entrepreneurial sector "would argue that effective quality assurance and improvement processes are perhaps more vital for the survival and future success of such institutions than they are for traditional institutions" (p. 78). Sharma

(2004) argued that university research funding was placed on a performance-based footing by the Australian government since 2002. Entrepreneurial universities in that country would, therefore, by their very nature, be better poised to deal with that new scenario than traditional universities.

The reasons given by Davies (1987) and Clark (1998) for the movement towards entrepreneurialism have been corroborated by Rinne and Koivula (2005). In reviewing the literature on the changing environment and culture of European universities they confirmed that universities were still in turmoil with no end in sight (Clark, 1998). They confirmed that higher education institutions were still expected to do more with less. As well, the changing place of the university and the resulting clash of values, the many stakeholders who had to be satisfied and the fact that universities cannot escape marketisation remained as obstacles. This, of course, reinforces Clark's (1998) view that universities are caught up in grand contradictions - more to do with less money, the need to satisfy all stakeholders and to be faster and flexible in their operations. Clark (1998, p.146), however, concludes that:

The entrepreneurial response offers a formula for institutional development that puts autonomy on a self-defined basis: [that is] diversify income to increase financial resources, provide discretionary money, and reduce governmental dependency; develop new units outside traditional departments to introduce new environmental relationships and new modes of thought and training.

Based on the above it is evident that universities which are still operating in the traditional mode must quickly change their operations despite the fact that change is not easily embraced and in some cases resisted. Robbins (1993) described the different kinds of resistance to change, namely, overt, implicit, immediate and deferred change, and differentiated individual resistance to change from organizational resistance to change. With respect to the individual, resistance could be displayed if the individual feels threatened because of the fear of the unknown, economic factors, or interference with what she/he is accustomed to. As far as the organizational resistance to change is concerned, this comes about

because of the threat to established resource allocations, the threat to established power relationships, the threat to expertise, structural inertia, group inertia and limited focus of change. In a traditional university setting with a seasoned traditional academic staff, resistance from some members of that sector is a foregone conclusion. Rinne and Koivula (2005, p. 114) put it this way: “Academics meet different circumstances very flexibly, they accept the reforms which they like and refuse or shape those they do not like”.

Over the last 20 years, then, there have been significant developments in the concept of the Entrepreneurial University (Yusof & Jain, 2007; Guerrero-Cano, Kirby, & Urbano, 2006). One of these is the emergence of corporate research which has been supported by efforts to commercialize research and secure patents. Another is that in addition to their teaching and research functions, entrepreneurial universities have been expected to behave more like economic and social enterprises. At the St. Augustine Campus, while corporate research has not yet been established, commercial behavior has been demonstrated by the activities of the Health Economics Unit.

This may have made the definition of the entrepreneurial university more difficult and complex. A recent effort at clarifying a definition is found in Guerrero-Cano, Kirby and Urbano (2006). While their study may be criticised for adopting a more commercially-based understanding of entrepreneurship within universities, they have reinforced the fact that there is no one definition of an entrepreneurial university by outlining and comparing the definitions of nine authors of such definitions (Etzkowitz, 1983; Chrisman, et al, 1995; Dill, 1995; Clark, 1998; Ropke, 1998; Subotzky, 1999; Kirby, 2002a; Etzkowitz, 2003; and Jacob et al, 2003) in an attempt to come up with their own definition. They eventually based their definition on the definitions of Clark (1998), Kirby (2002a) and Etzkowitz (2003):

An entrepreneurial university is defined as an university that have [sic] the ability to innovate, recognize and create opportunities, work in teams, take risks and respond to challenges, on its own, seeks to work out a substantial shift in organizational character so as to arrive at a more promising posture for the future (p. 5).

Another important feature of the literature of entrepreneurial universities is how the term is operationalised. Clark (1998) firmly believed that it was necessary for universities to be transformed into entrepreneurial organizations in order to survive in the twenty-first century. Clark (1998, pp. 3-4) treats “entrepreneurial” as “a willful effort in institution building” and risk-taking by entire universities and their internal departments, research centres, faculties and schools. Entrepreneurship is an organized, collective action “biased toward adaptive change” (p. 4). He acknowledged the establishment of innovative programmes within universities but was adamant that such programmes did not constitute university transformation. Although Boyer had outlined five challenges and Davies, in addition to identifying similar challenges, had proposed a possible structural reorganization, Clark (1998) went a step further by identifying five transformative elements of an entrepreneurial university. His concept of transformation was supplemented with the concept of sustainability in which he sought to identify institutional elements that sustained transformation and encouraged further change (Clark, 2004).

He set out a blueprint for creating entrepreneurial universities – pathways to transformation based on his case studies of five European Innovative Universities. In describing how universities by means of entrepreneurial action transformed themselves, necessary elements he pointed to were (1998, p. 5):

- a strengthened steering core;
- an expanded developmental periphery;
- a diversified funding base;
- a stimulated academic heartland;
- an integrated entrepreneurial culture

Leadership and Management of the Entrepreneurial University

The question then is who will lead traditional organizations into the entrepreneurial realm? Kotter (1990, pp. 5-6) argued that “despite some similarities, differences exist which make management and leadership very

distinct”. He further argued that the fundamental difference between leadership and management was their primary function. “The first can produce useful change, the second can create orderly results which keep something working efficiently” (p. 7). However, Kotter quickly pointed out that management and leadership together can make an effective organization. “Leadership by itself never keeps an operation on time and on budget year after year. And management by itself never creates significant useful change” (p. 7). Kotter’s view on leadership and management is shared by Davies et al (2001) who quoted Khaleelee and Woolf (1996) in expressing their view that management was about coping with complexity while leadership was about coping with change.

Cangemi (1975, p. 229) acknowledged that there was a difference between the aim of business and the aim of education. While business was profit-oriented and materialistic, education was dedicated to humanity. However, he was of the view that in the area of leadership, business had much to offer to education, particularly higher education. Twenty-six years later, Davies et al (2001, p. 1025) posited that “models of governance based on the notion of collegiality do not sit comfortably with pressures from customers who expect a business-like response in dynamic situations. A more focused organizational vision is needed that includes an outward-facing, customer-centred element, which is at conflict with the inward-looking culture that previously was prevalent in universities. The main sources of these pressures on higher education establishments are students, the government, the business community and the local community”. They argued that “leadership was needed to combine the collegiality ethos of universities with the responsive, business-like approach demanded by customers” (p. 1026). Davies et al (2001, pp. 1027-1028) went on to explain that although the development of leadership was always promoted in higher education, albeit mainly in the research fields, citing part of the requirement for a chair in United Kingdom universities as demonstrating academic leadership, “the running of faculties and schools has been based on management as opposed to leadership”.

The literature therefore has provided evidence to show that although there are some critics who are not in favour of entrepreneurialism in higher education institutions, the prevailing view is that going the entrepreneurial route is inevitable

in a globalized world. We might then consider on the basis of the literature reviewed so far in this chapter whether it is possible to define an ideal type entrepreneurial university and if so what it looks like, with a view to locating St. Augustine as a form of entrepreneurial university. What then does the ideal type entrepreneurial university look like? An early insight is provided by Davies (1987) who outlined ways in which the development of the entrepreneurial university could be positively encouraged. As a means of overcoming resistance to the adoption of entrepreneurialism among existing personnel he advocated changes with respect to personnel policies and practices and changes with respect to financial policies and practices. Davies recommended that staff should be assessed and compensated for performing all the tasks associated with entrepreneurialism in higher education institutions and not only on the traditional tasks of research, teaching and public service.

Marginson and Considine (2000, p. 4) went a step further in providing insight into the characteristics of the entrepreneurial university although they preferred the term “enterprise university” as opposed to “corporate university” or “entrepreneurial university”. They posited that some of the characteristics associated with the enterprise university were strong executive control, the distinctly corporate character of university missions and governing bodies, the emergence of vice chancellor’s advisory committees and private ‘shadow’ university structures alongside the established traditional senates and councils and the contesting of space in the academy by departments and disciplines and the new emerging research centres. As well, they argued that driving the above changes was a redefined internal economy in which under-funding was the driver of a ‘pseudo-market’, elements of which, for example the education of international students, are driven by a frankly commercial and entrepreneurial spirit. With respect to the definitions of quality and lines of accountability, Marginson and Considine (2000) advised that these were now drawn more from the private sector and the culture of economic consumption as opposed to the traditional public sector and political cultures. Additionally, Yusof and Jain (2007, p. 9) argued that the entrepreneurial university exhibited “organizational characteristics of structure, leadership, control systems, human resource systems and culture”.

Based on the definitions and characteristics of the entrepreneurial university which have been discussed and the four categories of inhibitors/barriers to entrepreneurialism deduced from Lambert's (2006) generated list, we might infer that a university is an entrepreneurial one if it satisfies the following five criteria. It should have:

- a governance structure and climate that is responsive, sensitive and capable of leading and managing organizational change and capable of making fast and accurate decisions
- the capacity to develop sustainable financial and economic autonomy/independence
- a core entrepreneurial vision and values that live and breathe in the people, processes and the operations/practices
- the ability to anticipate, seize and optimize/benefit from opportunities using innovation, expertise and research-led knowledge and professional knowledge (taking what you know and packaging it to make it sell)
- an appraisal system and compensation package synonymous with its entrepreneurial nature and characteristics

To what extent, then, does the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine Campus fit into this ideal type scenario? In order to fully establish my case I have to show both (a) that it had been a 'traditional' university and (b) that it was becoming an 'entrepreneurial' university, as a result of the activities outlined in the Introduction, which I will discuss in the following chapters.

With respect to the criterion of governance structure and climate, as mentioned in the introductory chapter of this study, the University of the West Indies has traditionally been run on the committees and board system. The nature of this system does not easily lend itself to making quick and fast decisions. It is a traditional system and as such the more long standing members of staff are quite comfortable with it. To the university's credit, however, some layers of its decision making process were eliminated in 1994 based on the report and

recommendations of the Chancellor's Commission on Governance of UWI. However, the process is still slow and cumbersome with three scheduled available opportunities per year for approving changes or for making major decisions. However, as I shall show in the following chapters, with the advent of the Continuing Engineering Education Centre and the Faculty of Social Sciences Summer Programme the University was forced to review and make policy changes, albeit in an *ad hoc* fashion, to accommodate the entrepreneurial climate that was creeping into the traditional system. One example of this is the introduction of a financial system that allows for fast and accurate transactions. In 2002, a decision was taken to acquire financial software, the Banner financial system. The traditional paper-based accounting and financial system was therefore discontinued and the computerized system has certainly contributed to the faster processing of all financial matters on the campus, including the payment to suppliers. The acquisition and use of this modern financial software have certainly brought the St. Augustine campus in line with other modern entrepreneurial institutions in which a faster processing time is the order of the day.

As far as the development of sustainable financial and economic autonomy/independence is concerned, one of the findings of the Social Sciences case was that while some of the University's traditionalist administrators were of the view that even though the Social Sciences Summer Programme was able not only to sustain itself but to realize profits within its first year of operations, it was not going to last. However, the continued financially viable operations of the Summer Programmes and the Health Economic Unit case demonstrate that the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine has the capacity to develop sustainable financial and economic autonomy/independence.

Regarding the third criterion of a core entrepreneurial vision and values, there was initially no clear statement on this requirement. During the early years of the Continuing Engineering Education Centre, the Summer Programmes and the Health Economics Unit, strategic plans were not in existence and as such the opportunity for staff at all levels to be a part of the formulation of such plans also did not exist. In such circumstances, the living and breathing of core values of the

institution, entrepreneurial or otherwise, were also not articulated. However, as stated in chapter 1, the University is now operating with its third strategic plan. Since the inception of strategic plans for the period 1997-2002, suggestions of ways and means of ensuring that the entrepreneurial vision and values are lived and become part of the culture of the University have been given more attention. One suggestion as to how this can be developed further will be expounded in the final chapter of this thesis.

With respect to the fourth criterion, the initial focus of the University of the West Indies was to provide tertiary level education for persons in the Caribbean to which fifteen governments provided funding so there was no urgent need for the institution to deliberately set out to be financially independent. The market-driven language of “the ability to anticipate, seize and optimize/benefit from opportunities using innovation, expertise and research”, therefore, was certainly not the type of language spoken or dreamt about by the majority of academic staff at the University prior to the birth of entrepreneurial units. However, the findings will show that the entrepreneurial leaders and managers of the Continuing Engineering Education Centre, the Faculty of Social Sciences Summer Programme and the Health Economic Units were all able to do exactly that – seize and optimize the benefits from opportunities using innovation, expertise, research and professional knowledge.

The fifth criterion addresses the appraisal and compensation system which essentially is a part of the human resource principles and practices of any institution. In 1997 the University of the West Indies agreed to acquire PeopleSoft, a human resource software package that certainly transformed the administration and management aspect of the University’s workforce, especially with respect to the hiring and payment of staff members. This efficient and faster system is synonymous with the nature of an entrepreneurial university. However, the appraisal system and the compensation package at the University of the West Indies are still traditional in nature. As stated in the University’s ordinance that deals with the appointment, appraisal and dismissal of academic staff, Ordinance 8, such staff members are assessed on the following criteria:

- research
- teaching
- publications
- contribution to university life
- scholarly and professional activity
- public service

There are no official weightings on the six criteria but in reality an extremely heavy weight is placed on research and publications. With respect to the compensation package, the market-driven criterion of pay-for-performance is certainly not a part of the University's method of remuneration. Salaries are determined and based on the collective agreement between management and the West Indies Group of University Teachers (WIGUT). Entrepreneurial activity is not catered for in the appraisal system. Neither is it catered for in the terms and conditions of service. It is, therefore, in this area of human resource principles and practices that the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine does not conform at all to the ideal type entrepreneurial university.

Based on the literature reviewed, and my advancement of the tenets of the ideal entrepreneurial university, one can say that innovativeness, self direction and self-sustenance, profit orientation, ability to satisfy several objectives at the same time and, most important, the ability to provide a business-like response in a dynamic situation are all characteristics associated with an entrepreneurial unit. These characteristics are in line with Rinne & Koivula's (2005) definition of the entrepreneurial university given at the beginning of this chapter i.e. entrepreneurial action, structures and attitude in a university.

That is to say, *before the birth of the five programmes that were investigated, the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine as an entity certainly did not have the identified entrepreneurial university characteristics and therefore could not be classified as an entrepreneurial university.* However, the Faculty of Social Sciences Summer Programme, the Faculty of Humanities and Education Summer Programme, the Faculty of Science and Agriculture Summer Programme, the

Continuing Engineering Education Centre and the Health Economics Unit, when they came into being, all displayed some or all of the characteristics associated with an entrepreneurial university. Their impact on the transformation of university administration at the University of the West Indies does not corroborate Clark's view that such programmes could be readily sealed off as minor enclaves. My aim, therefore, is to challenge Clark's assumption that only the top-down approach could lead to the successful transformation of universities into entrepreneurial organizations.

One further question, therefore, is necessary. I felt that it was necessary to find out if each programme, at the birth stage, was entrepreneurial in nature or developed into entrepreneurial units. Other questions that needed to be answered in my attempt to further challenge Clark's assumption were whether there were barriers and obstacles as outlined in the literature, before the birth of each programme and during their early years, and if there were, to identify how they were handled. Each programme stimulated and demanded policy changes and therefore it was necessary to find out the relationship between the entrepreneurial units within the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine and policy formulation. Since Kotter (1990, pp. 5-6) advocated leadership for the production of useful change and management for the creation of orderly results and Davies et al (2001, p. 1026) were of the firm view that leadership was a necessary ingredient in the combining of the collegial ethos associated with universities and the business-like approach that was now being demanded by customers, I thought that it would be useful to explore the extent to which leadership played a role in the success of each programme and to document the knowledge gained from that exploration.

Conclusion

On the basis of this review of the literature on what characterises an entrepreneurial university, it is suggested that 20 years ago, the St. Augustine Campus of the University of the West Indies substantially failed to meet the criteria that emerge from the literature, but that it did display those associated with 'traditional' universities. Also on the basis of that review, it may be argued that it can now be classified as an emerging entrepreneurial university based on the

inroads that were made as a result of the entrepreneurial units, and this will be examined in the following chapters which look at the examples of entrepreneurial activity, and their consequences.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

I have argued so far that the operations of the Faculty of Social Sciences Summer Programme at the St. Augustine Campus of the University of the West Indies, and the other entrepreneurial activities that it gave rise to, seemed to contradict Clark's assumption that the transformation to entrepreneurialism by higher education organizations would be accomplished from the top down and that units like the Social Sciences Summer Programme should be cast aside as minor enclaves. As a member of staff in the institution I was aware of the impact of that unit on the rest of the university community, so I chose to undertake an empirical study of 'minor enclaves' at the St. Augustine Campus to test his assumption.

The following research questions were formulated based on the questions raised in the last chapter with respect to the Faculty of Social Sciences Summer Programme unit.

1. Was the Summer Programme recognized as an entrepreneurial unit in its early years and was it intended to be an entrepreneurial unit?
2. Were there barriers/obstacles in the creation of an entrepreneurial unit within a traditional university?
3. What is the relationship between an entrepreneurial unit within a traditional university and policy formulation?
4. Does leadership play a role in driving entrepreneurialism from a minor enclave?

Pilot Study

A pilot case study entitled "Building Entrepreneurialism from a Minor Enclave: The Case of the Faculty of Social Sciences Summer Programme", a historical case study was first undertaken before committing to the larger study. The Social Sciences Summer Programme was chosen for the pilot because it was the operations of that unit led me to question Clark's assumption. In an effort to study the phenomenon of the Faculty of Social Sciences Summer Programme in its

context, with a view to answering my research questions, I felt that it was necessary to peruse all documents relating to the programme since it is a key aspect of case study research. In keeping with the characteristics of a traditional university, events of any kind are recorded in written documents. These documents included minutes of meetings in which decisions about the programme were taken and relevant letters and memoranda between the relevant university senior administrative staff and the Dean and Deputy Dean of the Faculty.

I was the Secretary to the Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences during the period 1990 to 1997 and was aware that relevant information, with respect to the Social Sciences Summer Programme, was available in memoranda, letters and minutes of meetings. Noting, as well, the advice from Punch (2005 p. 184) that “documents, both historical and contemporary, are a rich source of data”, I therefore requested from the Records Centre at the St. Augustine Campus of the University of the West Indies all the relevant files that I thought would provide documentary data pertaining to my specific research questions. Another source of information that I felt was important for the case study was interview data. I interviewed Dr. PK who was the Deputy Dean of the Faculty during the early years of the Summer Programme, since I was aware that he played a major role in bringing the Summer Programme to life. *His views and comments were also sought because of my experience that everything that is said is not always recorded in minutes of meetings and that meanings rest not solely in documents but in people.*

The findings indicated that the programme played a tremendous role in driving entrepreneurialism at the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine in terms of the visionary leadership of the creator of the programme, the ad hoc policy changes that the University was forced to make because of the business-like operations of the unit and the financial success that the unit enjoyed. Based on those findings, I argued that a minor enclave cannot be cast aside as suggested by Clark (1998) but can play a meaningful role in the transformation of a traditional university into an entrepreneurial entity. Following the pilot study, I decided to extend the study to cover other units within the University that had established

programmes that could be seen as entrepreneurial. Consequently, the research questions were modified to suit the larger study involving five units as follows:

1. Why and how was each unit created and was each one entrepreneurial in nature from its very beginning?
2. What barriers/obstacles were encountered in the creation of each entrepreneurial unit within the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine Campus?
3. What is the relationship between the entrepreneurial units within the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine and policy formulation?
4. Did leadership play a role in driving entrepreneurialism in each unit?

Punch (2005, p. 54) emphasized that “the connection from content to method is through data: what data will be needed, and how will they be collected and analyzed?” Therefore in order to answer the research questions I considered what data I would need and what was the best way to capture and analyze such data? This led to the issue of research design. It is in determining the research design that the questions of what data are needed, how they were to be obtained, in order to address which questions, are addressed.

RESEARCH DESIGN

Given the centrality of the entrepreneurial activities themselves I initially thought that a questionnaire survey might in fact answer my research questions. Questions could be formulated in order that the opinions of certain groups could be ascertained about the entrepreneurial activities that were taking place or to even find out whether they were of the view that what had been taking place were indeed entrepreneurial activities. The survey approach, however, invariably provides the researcher with quantitative data that will help him or her to find, among other things, measurable and countable answers to questions. These data are analyzed and presented as summaries of information represented symbolically by numbers. Using descriptive statistics the data are presented as mean scores, the calculation of frequency distribution, the relationship between independent and dependent variables and the comparison of groups on a dependent variable.

However, that approach to data collection would not help me in finding answers to questions about how the entrepreneurial units were created, the barriers and or obstacles that were faced, the part leadership played in the process and the policies that were created because of the birth of the units. The questions to be answered were not related to answers expressed as symbolic representations of information as numbers, but were concerned with answers expressed as symbolic representations of the stories and understandings of the entrepreneurial phenomenon in words. The survey approach and, by extension, a quantitative methodology, therefore, did not seem to be suitable for my research study.

Other approaches such as the grounded theory approach, the ethnographic approach and the case study approach were then considered. I will now discuss each one of them with a view to establishing which approach was most suitable for my study keeping my research questions in mind.

Grounded Theory

Creswell (1998, pp. 55-56) advises that “the intent of a grounded theory study is to generate or discover a theory”. Punch (2005, p. 155) explained that grounded theory was not a theory but an approach or strategy for doing research, whose purpose was to generate theory from data. The development of the strategy is attributed to Glaser and Strauss who wrote a book entitled “The Discovery of Grounded Theory” which detailed the methods they had developed and used in their book entitled “Awareness of Dying”. Punch (2005, p. 156) advised that Strauss and Corbin (1994, p. 225) advocated that the book “had three purposes: to offer the rationale for theory that was grounded, to suggest the logic for and specifics of grounded theories and to legitimate careful qualitative research”. Though the grounded theory approach seemed quite interesting it did not seem suitable for my study since I already had a theory, that entrepreneurialism in traditional higher education institutions could be advanced by means of the bottom-up approach through a combination of minor enclaves. I was, therefore, not interested in generating or discovering a theory from collected data, but in finding out how each enclave came and continued into being and also to pass on that knowledge to other managers/administrators of traditional higher education

institutions who were interested in pursuing the challenge of turning them into entrepreneurial organizations.

Ethnography

Ethnographic studies are committed to cultural interpretation. Ethnography is the study and understanding of the cultural and symbolic aspects of a cultural or social group or system. An ethnographic approach is potentially useful in studying and interpreting the meaning of the cultural and social issues associated with an entrepreneurial unit. Punch (2005) advised that some of the main characteristics of ethnography are that:

- it starts with the assumption that the shared cultural meanings of the group are crucial to understanding its behaviour
- the ethnographer is sensitive to the meanings that behaviour, actions, events and context have in the eyes of the people involved
- the group or case is studied in its natural setting
- it is likely to be an unfolding and evolving sort of study, rather than prestructured
- from the point of view of data collection techniques, ethnography is eclectic, not restricted
- ethnographic data collection will typically be prolonged and repetitive.

Creswell (1998, p. 61) warned that ethnography is challenging to use because:

- the researcher needs to have a grounding in cultural anthropology
- the time to collect data is extensive, involving prolonged time in the field
- the narratives in ethnographies are written in a literary, almost storytelling approach that may limit the audience for the work
- the possibility that the researcher will 'go native' and be unable to complete the study or be compromised in the study

Essentially an ethnographic study is typically suitable for studying contemporary phenomena, but it may also be useful in understanding the evolution of a group's experience and the meanings associated with it. In a contemporary study, the researcher observes and/or participates in what is happening in order to collect data for his or her study. This approach was initially thought to be quite appropriate at least for the study of the Social Sciences unit. I was an insider in that Faculty and as such a participant observer. I had the benefit of information that someone on the outside would not have been privy to which would allow me to understand the Social Sciences experience in a way that an outsider may not be able to. Although Clark's (1998) model advocated the top-down approach, there seemed to be a different approach in the experiences of the minor enclaves or entrepreneurial units at UWI, St. Augustine. However, since my study was intended to find out how and why all these entrepreneurial units came into being and not just the Social Sciences unit, together with the challenges/barriers they faced, whether leadership played a role in their formation and in particular, the relationship between entrepreneurial units and policy formulation at the level of the University, I was of the view that the ethnographic approach would not address all my research questions for all the units to be studied. The study was also intended to not only test Burton Clark's assumption, but to offer some advice to managers/administrators of higher education institutions based on the experiences of leaders and managers of the entrepreneurial units.

Case Studies

Creswell (1998, p. 61) described a case study as "an exploration of a 'bounded system' or a case (or multiple cases) over time through detailed, in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information rich in context". This description is similar to Punch's (1998, p. 45) first characteristic of case studies. His other characteristics are that the case must be a case of something, that there must be an explicit attempt to preserve the wholeness, unity and integrity of the case and finally that multiple sources of data and multiple data collection methods are likely to be used, typically in a naturalistic setting. It must be noted that the case study is not necessarily only a qualitative technique since information can be

gathered not only from natural settings, interviews, narrative reports, documents etc. but from questionnaires and numerical data. However, as far as my research questions were concerned, which as mentioned earlier, assumed that meanings rest not solely in documents but in people, the data that could be collected using the case study approach and a qualitative methodology, utilizing documentary data and interviews as opposed to survey questionnaire, seemed very suitable for addressing them. As well, the case study approach would also allow me to compare units (enclaves). The case study, therefore, was the obvious and natural choice for my study. As well, my choice of the qualitative methodology for this study is supported by Creswell (1998, p. 15) who described qualitative research this way:

Qualitative research is an inquiry process of understanding based on distinct methodological traditions of inquiry that explore a social or human problem. The researcher builds a complex, holistic picture, analyzes words, reports, detailed views of informants, and conducts the study in a natural setting.

Creswell went on further to explain that he emphasized a “complex, holistic picture” because he is of the view that a complex narrative would take “the reader into the multiple dimensions of a problem or issue and displays it in all of its complexity” (1998, p. 15). This overall approach seemed useful in addressing the potentially complex narrative that would explore the questions about how the enclaves came into being, the barriers and or obstacles they faced along the way, whether policy formulation was influenced by their very existence and the role of leadership in bottom-up entrepreneurial units.

Yin (2003, p 14) posits that the case study is a comprehensive research strategy since it covers the “logic of design, data collection techniques, and specific approaches to data analysis”. To this end, he defines a case study as an “empirical enquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident” (p. 13). He further posits that “the case study inquiry copes with the technically distinctive situation in which there will be many more variables of

interest than data points, and as one result relies on multiple sources of evidence, with data needing to converge in a triangulating fashion, and as another result benefits from the prior development of theoretical propositions to guide data collection and analysis” (pp. 13-14).

Taking into consideration Yin’s view that the case study in itself is a research strategy, the social science researcher is therefore faced with at least five major strategies from which to choose in coming up with his/her research design namely, experiments, surveys, archival analyses, histories and case studies. Yin (2003, p. 3) advised that the choice of strategy should be based on three conditions (p. 5):

- (1) the type of research questions posed
- (2) the extent of control an investigator has over actual behavioral events
- (3) the degree of focus on contemporary as opposed to historical events

My research questions focused on *how* the entrepreneurial unit went about creating itself, outlining as well the barriers/obstacles it faced in the process, *why* it was necessary to create such a unit, whether leadership played a role in driving the unit and whether new policy had to be formulated because of the establishment of the unit. Given the type of research questions posed, and taking into consideration my lack of control over actual behaviour since the focus was on historical decisions and events the case study research strategy seemed suitable for this study. Yin’s (2003, p. 8) idea that “the case study’s unique strength is its ability to deal with a full variety of evidence – documents, artifacts, interviews, and observations” also influenced my choice of strategy, since I believed that the examination and analysis of relevant documents and interviews with persons involved in the creation of the units would provide data relating to my research questions.

With respect to the analysis of case study data Yin (2003, p. 115) posited that “the best preparation for conducting case study analysis is to have a general analytic

strategy” and outlined three main strategies that can be used in analyzing case study evidence namely:-

- relying on theoretical propositions
- thinking about rival explanations
- developing a case description

He explained that relying on theoretical propositions was the most preferred strategy since that strategy allowed the researcher to follow the theoretical proposition that led him/her to conduct the case study in the first place. The second strategy, Yin explained, allows the researcher to try to define and test rival explanations while the third analytic strategy allows the researcher to develop a descriptive framework for organizing the case study. Yin is also of the view that without any of the above named “strategies (or alternatives to them) case study analysis will proceed with difficulty” (p. 115). He further advised that there were at least five analytic techniques which should be used along with the chosen analytic strategy. These he described as pattern matching, explanation building, time-series analysis, logic models and cross-case synthesis. The latter analytical technique, cross-case synthesis seemed appropriate for this particular study because of the nature of the study: the type of research questions and the number of cases being investigated.

Stake (1994) outlined three main types of case studies, namely:

1. the intrinsic case study in which the study is undertaken because the researcher wants a better understanding of this particular case
2. the instrumental case study in which a particular case is examined to give insight into an issue, or to refine a theory
3. the collective case study in which the instrumental case study is extended to cover several cases, to learn more about the phenomenon, population or general condition.

Stake’s second and third type of case studies, the instrumental case study and the collective case study seemed quite appropriate for this thesis.

In summary, therefore, my study deals with investigating how entrepreneurialism was driven from minor enclaves at the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine Campus. Based on the formulated research questions, I was of the view that they would be best answered if a case study design and a qualitative methodology was used. This view is corroborated by some of the characteristics of qualitative research and the qualitative researcher as espoused by Creswell (2003) who emphasized four characteristics of qualitative research (1-4) and four characteristics of the qualitative researcher (5-8) namely:

1. Qualitative research takes place in the natural setting
2. Qualitative research uses multiple methods that are interactive and humanistic
3. Qualitative research is emergent rather than tightly prefigured
4. Qualitative research is fundamentally interpretive
5. The qualitative researcher views social phenomena holistically
6. The qualitative researcher systematically reflects on who he or she is in the inquiry and is sensitive to his or her personal biography and how it shapes the study
7. The qualitative researcher uses complex reasoning that is multifaceted, iterative and simultaneous
8. The qualitative researcher adopts and uses one or more strategies of inquiry as a guide for the procedures in the qualitative study

Historical case studies of the Faculty of Science and Agriculture Summer Programme, the Faculty of Humanities and Education Summer Programme, the Continuing Engineering Education Centre and the Health Economics Unit were then undertaken. Information gained from these case studies and the evidence from the pilot case study of the Faculty of Social Sciences Summer Programme were used in my attempt not only to challenge Clark's assumption, but to put forward my own recommendations with respect to the transformation of traditional higher education institutions into entrepreneurial organizations.

DATA COLLECTION

Two main types of data were collected for this study, documentary data and interview data. Documents are a rich source of data in social research and therefore analysis of documents and texts when they are available provides valuable information to the researcher. Silverman (1993) applied textual analysis to files, statistical records, records of official proceedings and images and argued that there are several ways of thinking about textual analysis and therefore many different theoretical perspectives can be applied. Punch (2005, p. 228) reported that Silverman (1993, p. 89) was convinced that sociologists made too little use of the great potential of texts as rich data, especially in light of their relatively easy accessibility.

Consistent with Silverman's (1993) views, I was also of the view that the analysis of written documents would provide answers to my research questions. Additionally, I also believed that responses to interview questions to key personnel associated with the various faculties and schools would most likely provide answers to my research questions.

I followed a similar procedure in the collection of data for the larger study as I did for the pilot study. Documentary data and data from interviews were sought since that proved to be quite adequate and successful for the pilot study. The Records Manager, who was extremely helpful during the pilot study and now elated that a historical record of the Social Sciences Summer Programme would soon be available in one text (after I publish it!!) was more than excited to provide documentary data on the Faculty of Science and Agriculture and the Faculty of Humanities and Education Summer Programmes, the Continuing Engineering Education Centre and the Heath Economics Unit. As in the pilot study, in addition to the documentary evidence, I chose to use interviews as a means of collecting data for this thesis since I am in full agreement with Punch (2005, p. 168) that an interview is "a very good way of accessing people's perceptions, meanings, definitions of situations and construction of reality". Critics may argue that a questionnaire could probably provide that same kind of information but the

interview allows the interviewer to immediately ask follow-up questions based on the responses of the interviewees.

There are, of course, different kinds of interviews. For example, Punch (2005, p. 170-172) explained that interviews can be of at least three types, namely, the structured interview in which respondents are asked a series of “pre-established questions with preset response categories”, the group interview “where the researcher works with several people simultaneously” and the traditional unstructured interview which is a non-standardized, open-ended, in depth interview. This third type is more suitable for ethnographic studies. However, Yin (2003, pp. 89-92) in arguing that the interview was one of the most important sources of case study information, categorized interviews as either open-ended in nature, focused or structured along the lines of a formal survey. In the case of the open-ended interview, Yin is of the view that respondents may be considered as ‘an informant’ since the information gained from that interviewee may be used as a basis for further inquiry by the interviewer. He explained that the focused interview may be open-ended in nature and conversational but in this case the interviewee will be responding to questions which were derived from the case study protocol. This type of interview can be useful when the researcher is using other sources of data collection and therefore information gained from the interviews could be used as a means of determining whether information from those other sources corroborates with the data from the interviews. With respect to the survey type interview, he is of the view that this method should be used when research questions would be more successfully answered with the use of quantitative data. Yin’s focused open-ended conversational type interview was used for this study. While pre-determined questions were asked this type of interview allowed me to probe deeper based on the responses given. This type of interview was also appropriate since I was interviewing people that I knew. The data from the interview responses and the data from the documents were compared in my attempt to determine whether there was corroboration between the two sets of data.

In this larger study, all the persons who were interviewed from the different programmes were asked the same questions since the analysis includes cross-case

analyses among the five cases. Of the three types of interviews outlined by Yin (2005), the focused interview was used since it not only allowed me to ask pre-set questions but it also afforded the benefit of open-endedness which provided useful information with respect to corroboration or with respect to identifying other sources of pertinent information.

Selecting the Interviewees

The question then was who should be interviewed and why such persons should be interviewed. At the University of the West Indies, faculties are managed by deans and departments or units are managed by departmental heads or unit heads. The Deans are the ones who are allowed to take proposals of any kind to the authorized Boards and Committees. In the case of the Faculty of Social Sciences the Dean permitted the Deputy Dean, Student Matters to present the proposal and manage the programme when it was finally approved. However, with respect to the Faculties of Humanities and Education and Science and Agriculture, the submission of the proposals for the programmes and the management of the programmes in the early years were carried out by the Office of the Dean. The Engineering Institute is managed by a Director who is appointed with the full blessings of the Dean of the Faculty of Engineering. However, the Engineering Institute was born out of the Continuing Engineering Education Centre in the Faculty of Engineering. The centre is managed by a committee led by an appointed chairman. The Health Economics Unit in the Department of Economics is managed by a coordinator who is in fact its founder.

On the basis of this information, I was of the view that the persons alluded to above would best provide the information on the birth and early years of each programme and therefore would be the most suitable persons to be interviewed. They were first contacted informally. However, a formal letter was emailed to them requesting the interview. Two hard copies were brought to the interview and each interviewee was asked to sign them to indicate their willingness and approval to be interviewed. One signed copy was kept by the interviewee and one kept by the interviewer. The letter included the reasons for the request for the interview (see Appendix I). As well, in that same letter, I asked them to allow me to peruse

any administrative documents that the units may have e.g. progress reports and/or evaluation reports of the respective programmes, financial statements and recommendations. In the case of the Faculty of Humanities and Education, Mr. VS who was the Dean of the Faculty when the programme began agreed to be interviewed. Unfortunately, the person who was the Dean of the Faculty of Science and Agriculture during the birth of its Summer Programme was unable to be interviewed due to illness. However, the Senior Administrative Assistant, who was the operational person behind that programme was willing and able to be interviewed. With respect to the Continuing Engineering Education Centre, Prof CI was interviewed since he was the Chairman of the Continuing Engineering Education Centre which was the founding centre of the Engineering Institute during the successful period. As far as the Health Economics Unit was concerned, Prof. KT, Coordinator and founder of the Health Economics Unit was interviewed. In an effort to answer the research questions, the following interview questions were formulated:

1. Why did the programme start?
2. How did the programme start?
3. What were the obstacles preceding the birth and in the early years of the programme? How did you overcome them and did new ones arise?
4. Were there any perverse (or unexpected) outcomes for anybody? E.g. staff, students, administration etc.
5. Did you feel that you had the full support of the University Administration during the start up or early years of the programme?
6. Who were the persons who accessed the courses in the programme?
7. What have been the main successes of the programme?
8. What do you think were the factors that led to these successes?
9. Are there any other thoughts about the Programme you would like to share with me?

A convenient time for each interview was established between the interviewer and each interviewee. With the exception of one interview, i.e. the interview with Prof. KT, they all took place at the appointed time and venue. The interview with Prof. KT had to be rescheduled due to illness on his part. Each interview took

place in the private office of each interviewee. All the interviews were tape recorded and transcribed and each interviewee was given the opportunity to read the verbatim transcription and to add or minus any bit of information that they felt was necessary. In the case of the Health Economics Unit, Prof. KT, was delighted that his responses to my interview questions enabled the documenting of the history of the Health Economics Unit (HEU). He commented that he had not thought about doing it before I approached him for the interview. He advised that he had shared the verbatim transcription of his interview with the Assistant Coordinator of the Unit in his effort to ensure that information and events pertaining to the Unit were accurately recorded. She was a good resource person since she was a part of the unit from its inception (one of the initial five graduate students that constituted the first research team of the HEU).

It should be noted that in my effort to ensure that all the interviewees were prepared for the interview, the interview questions were emailed to them together with the official letter requesting the interview.

DATA ANALYSIS

As discussed in the design section Yin (2003, p. 115) posited that “the best preparation for conducting case study analysis is to have a general analytic strategy”. Since the eventual outcome of my study is to challenge Clark’s assumption, I felt that my general analytic strategy should definitely be the first and preferred strategy outlined by Yin i.e. relying on theoretical propositions. In the pilot study, the documents that I deemed relevant to my research paper were textually analyzed and the interview with Dr. PK was later transcribed. In order to make a comparative analysis of the documentary data and the responses to the interview, a three column grid was developed with the Research Questions in Column 1 and relevant documentary data and interview responses data to each question in Columns 2 and 3 respectively. I then attempted to determine whether there was corroboration of the information gained from the documents and information gained from the interview with Dr. PK. This larger study followed the same type of analysis for each case. Additionally, a comparative analyses of the

five cases based on themes generated from the Research Questions was undertaken and presented in Chapter 9 (cross case synthesis as described by Yin).

As mentioned earlier, the interviews were tape recorded and transcribed. To answer my research questions, I read the verbatim responses to the interview questions and identified phrases or sentences that provided information or answers to the research questions. The identified items were numbered 1 to 4 to correspond to each research question. In the case of documents such as letters, memoranda, notes and minutes, each one was summarized and numbered. The same coding process was used with the summarized version of the collected documents. The coded information was then put into the table (see Tables 1-5).

VALIDITY, RELIABILITY & ISSUES OF POSITIONALITY AND ETHICS

Burke Johnson (1997) posited that the term “validity” has been traditionally associated with the quantitative research tradition. However, he advised that the views of qualitative researchers with respect to that statement have been mixed. Some researchers (like Smith, 1984) are of the view that the concepts of reliability and validity with respect to qualitative research should be abandoned. However, Burke Johnson is of the view that “when qualitative researchers speak of research validity, they are usually referring to qualitative research that is plausible, credible, trustworthy, and therefore, defensible” (1997, p. 282). Burke Johnson, therefore, felt that it was not only important to think about the issue of validity in qualitative research but to examine strategies that have been developed by researchers in an effort to maximize validity. He formulated a table entitled “Strategies Used to Promote Qualitative Research Validity” (p. 283) using information provided from the work of (Kirk & Miller, 1986; Le Compte & Presssle, 1993; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Maxwell, 1996).

With respect to my study, four items of Burke Johnson’s table are relevant and were, therefore, used to ensure validity with respect to the researcher. These are low inference descriptors, triangulation, data triangulation and peer review. Burke Johnson described low inference descriptors as the use of description phrased very

close to the participants' accounts and researchers' field notes. For example, verbatims (i.e. direct quotations) are a commonly used type of low inference descriptors. I, therefore, as far as was possible, used direct quotations in the discussion sections of the thesis. Triangulation was achieved by cross checking information and conclusions acquired from the data from the interview and data from the official documents pertaining to each unit. Discussions with a disinterested peer who played devil's advocate were also conducted. That person's role was to challenge me to provide solid evidence for my interpretations and conclusions. I also held discussions with a colleague who is familiar with the research since like Burke Johnson (1997), I felt that that person could and indeed she provided useful challenges and insights.

As far as validity from the point of view of the participants of the study and persons external to the study is concerned, Creswell and Miller's (2000) table clearly identifies the areas to which attention should be paid.

Table A

Paradigm assumption/Lens	Postpositivist or Systematic Paradigm	Constructivist Paradigm	Critical Paradigm
Lens of the Researcher	Triangulation	Disconfirming Evidence	Researcher Reflexivity
Lens of Study Participants	Member checking	Prolonged engagement in the field	Collaboration
Lens of People External to Study (Audiences)	Audit Trail	Thick, rich description	Peer debriefing

Source: Creswell and Miller (2000)

With respect to the participants of the study, I interviewed persons associated with the birth and leadership of the programmes. These persons were given the opportunity to read the verbatim translation of their respective interviews and

given the opportunity to correct or rephrase answers that they gave when the initial questions were posed. Although this proved to be a time consuming exercise and prolonged the length of time that was spent with each interviewee, the final product turned out to be a more accurate version of what actually transpired. There were, of course, both opportunities and threats relating to my involvement in this study of my own institution. The persons who were interviewed agreed to be interviewed when the informal request was first made. The request was emailed to them and the actual hard copy was handed to them before the interview began. There was no evidence of a withdrawal of enthusiasm. In fact, they all seemed rather excited to be involved in my doctoral programme. The added problem of whether or not they told me what I wanted to hear or the truth of what actually took place was dealt with as a result of the triangulation of the data from the interviews and the information found in the documents.

One final and critical validity issue stems from the fact that I am a member of staff of the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine, which could have affected the study in a number of ways. For example, it is possible to think that my closeness to the organization being studied would have led to the production of biased data, especially where data from interview questions were concerned. For instance, did the interviewees tell me the same things they would have told anyone else or did they tell me things they thought I wanted to know. Two ways of making sure that that possibility was minimized are to be very much aware and alert to it, and to ensure that what was said was corroborated by other collected data. The first of these I endeavoured to keep at the front of my mind throughout the analysis, and I basically tried to address the second by means of the strategies suggested in the first -‘Postpositivist paradigm’- column of Table A above. Through the lens of the researcher, it should be noted that the data gained from the interviews corroborated with the data that were gained from the documents. As far as the lens of the participants were concerned, I have already mentioned in the Data Collection section that I enabled member checking through sending the respondents copies of their transcripts and encouraging them to make any changes they thought necessary. This point will be reemphasized later in this chapter in the positionality section. And finally, as I note below, I have consciously tried to lay down an audit trail that readers could follow. Overall, I feel that my closeness to

the institution proved to be advantageous to the study since I was able to have access to all the relevant documents. An ‘outsider’ may not have been granted the same access privileges that I enjoyed. The question as to whether an outsider would have interpreted the information in the same way as I did could arise but to counteract that I had to be always conscious of that possibility and to make myself as disinterested as possible during the collection of the data. Such issues are discussed further in the section on positionality below.

All documents relating to this study will be kept indefinitely. These include copies of letters to all interviewees, copies of all the documents relating to the establishment of the programmes from the university’s official records and copies of all documents relating to the programmes that were passed on by the interviewees. Copies of the actual questions asked, verbatim translations of all interviews and notes relating to the time and place and what transpired during each interview also form part of the documentation library associated with the study. The compilation of these records helped not only to ensure validity of the study but reliability as well, since another authorized researcher will be able to go through the documents, carry out the same research and come up with similar findings.

Positionality Issues

Sikes and Potts (2008, p. 5) advise that “nowadays researchers almost routinely include a declaration of their positionality in their research writings”. This researcher is no exception, especially given that as a member of staff of the St. Augustine Campus of the University of the West Indies, I am classified as an “inside researcher”. Therefore, I had to consider very carefully whether and how my being a staff member affected the study in any way and if it did how the associated issues should be handled? Edwards (2002) argues that there are both advantages and hazards to what he calls deep insider qualitative research. He defined “deep insider research” as “that undertaken by a person who has been a member of the organization or group under research for at least five years” (p. 71). Since I fall into that category it is appropriate for me to outline his list of advantages and hazards and discuss whether I benefited from similar advantages

and how I dealt with similar hazards, if in fact such hazards existed during my research of the minor enclaves' phenomena.

Advantages

1. Strongly grounded hermeneutics

Because the researcher (the interviewer) and the interviewees share a long standing relationship within the same organization, the researcher is able to test the data gathered against historical knowledge and bring that to bear in his or her understanding of what is being researched. I, as well, have historical knowledge of my organization and therefore enjoyed a similar benefit but the historical knowledge of the organization also allowed me the additional benefit of knowing where to look and how to look for relevant documentary data.

2. Charades and “cover stories” are more readily discovered

Since the researcher is part of the organization studied the likelihood that the interview data was much more likely be “charade proof” would strengthen the claims of validity of the data. This is assuming that the researcher, by being part of the organization would understand the ‘native talk’, the slogans and the body language of the interviewees. In my study charades and ‘cover stories’ were almost non existent since the documentary data confirmed the interview data, but I feel confident that I would have known if any of the interviewees had tried to introduce them.

3. Group agendas and histories are better known

The researcher understands all areas of the organization e.g. the landscape, the territory and even the unspoken agendas of groups within the organization. This understanding was useful because I had a good idea of the ‘baseline’ from which the programmes departed, which would not have been as available to an outsider who came in to study the programmes. This is borne out in the discussion of the cases studied in the following five chapters.

4. Individual agendas and histories are better known

“The researcher knows or possesses reasonable beliefs about the history, the corpses, the heroes, the skeletons, the failures and successes, the behaviours and

attitudes of *individuals* within the organization/group” (p. 75). The reputation of the persons who were interviewed was well known not only to me but to other members of the organization. For example, Dr. PK was known throughout the organization as the person responsible for the success of the Faculty of Social Sciences Summer Programme.

5. Organisational cultures are better known

The operating culture of the organization is very well known to the researcher. With respect to my study, because of my knowledge of the traditional culture of the organization, I was able to question Clark’s (1998) enclaves’ statement because I was able to see, and be a part of, the changes that were taking place within the organization as a result of the entrepreneurial units. That questioning, as I indicated earlier in this chapter, led me to carry out this study.

6. “Balkanised” subcultures are better known

“Balkanised” groups can lead to fragmentation in the organization. One example of this group is the then traditional administrators at the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine. This group, who were all accustomed to managing the university in a particular way, was convinced that the entrepreneurial activities would not be sustained. They therefore reinforced each other in putting stumbling blocks (barriers and obstacles) to prevent the entrepreneurial activities from moving along a smooth path. These barriers and obstacles will be discussed in Chapter 4, the Faculty of Social Sciences Summer Programme.

Hazards

1. Overlooking the familiar

Edwards (2002) argued that “the strength of insider research is also potentially its greatest weakness” (p. 77). He continued that sometimes “the material is so commonplace, so normal, so everyday for insider-researcher that the nuances, subtleties and indeed the “bleedin’ obvious” can escape observation” (p. 77). In my particular case “the ‘bleedin’ obvious” did not necessarily escape my observation, but because I was part of the organization, I sometimes took it for granted that the readers of this study would understand what I was talking about without going into much detail. Therefore, in writing up the thesis, I always had to

be reminded by my supervisor to be as explicit as possible for the benefit of the reader(s) who may not have the benefit of my insider knowledge of the organization.

2. Responding: Which way?

This hazard is associated with the non-fixed or given choices of responses the insider-researcher has in responding to answers or statements made by interviewees. A classical example given by Edwards (2002, p. 77) is the varied responses that an interviewer can give in response to statements made by an interviewee who was distressed at missing out on a promotion. Edwards (2002, p. 77) recommends gentle probing, “an approach which exercises caution against collusion but allows the individual to express feelings and responses in a safe and research-focused environment”. The interviewees in my study were not answering questions that were associated with a distressed situation but with a situation (the movement towards entrepreneurialism) which had been initially opposed, but which was now being applauded in the higher education environment.

3. Does the researcher’s new role change the relationship?

I am of the view that my relationship with the staff members who were interviewed has changed, but for the better. The administrator’s role and the academic role in a higher education institution are very distinct particularly in a traditional organization and the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine is no exception. Academics are involved in teaching and research and administrators look after the management of the organization. I was now a researcher and more than one interviewee expressed delight that because of my study, I did not only understand the business of research (by being an administrator in an academic institution), but was now involved in research. In fact one interviewee, Prof KT expressed the view that what I was doing was essential for the accurate recording of the birth and early years of the Health Economics Unit – something he had not thought about before I approached him for the interview. I am now considered as someone who can and has added value to the organization in an area that was originally perceived to be the domain of the academics and not the administrators.

4. How much does the researcher disclose in writing up the research?

In keeping with Creswell and Miller's (2000) table one way of ensuring validity through the lens of the participants in a study is member checking. All interviewees were allowed to read the verbatim transcript of their interview and were therefore given the opportunity to change or alter their responses in the interest of accuracy. They were also given the opportunity to ask for anything to be withdrawn. Thereafter, I was then free to disclose information gained in writing up the findings of my study. I did not consciously 'stay silent' about any issues raised in the interviews, for instance, for fear of embarrassing either the interviewees or the organization.

The above discussion demonstrates that there are advantages and disadvantages of being either an insider researcher or an outsider researcher. Both types are valuable. However, depending on the research topic one may be more valuable than the other. Like Mercer (2006) I am of the view that there are strengths and weaknesses in "insiderness" and "outsiderness" and as such they should not be looked at as an either/or option. In my particular situation, the "insiderness" was extremely beneficial since I understood the culture of the organization. I also knew where to look and how to look for documents in my quest to answer my research questions. One important thing is that the respondents were not in any way 'threatened' by, or frightened of, what I might find out and reveal. Far from it, they were essentially told that they were being asked about something that was very widely regarded as very positive in the present higher education industry.

Ethical Issues Arising from the Research

Brinkmann and Kvale (2005) concluded that since qualitative research is saturated with moral and ethical issues, researchers should be educated to "confront ethical reality skillfully" (pp. 157-158) rather than focusing on the construction and reconstruction of ethics. This means that based on the qualitative social science literature, I was expected to confront certain ethical challenges, and anticipate how to deal with them, and refine and adjust my techniques in the field. Ethics is concerned with behaving according to certain accepted standards or codes of practice. Certain types of pure experiments are not suited for social science

research based on practical as well as ethical grounds (Punch, 2005, 70-71). In the examples given by Punch, there are ethical violations because in conducting experiments, the participants' rights were not protected or their informed consent or permission was not obtained. Other ethical issues include a consideration of the worthiness of the research project, the competence of the researcher, and potential benefits to participants. As the study progresses, the researcher has to minimize and control the effects of the study so that no harm or risk to the reputations or integrity of individuals results. Also, efforts to protect their privacy and maintain their confidentiality need to be undertaken (Punch, 2005, p. 277). The issue of conflict of interest is another ethical issue that must be dealt with. Conflict of interest in a qualitative research setting can best be described as the use of information by persons who are privileged to know that information, for their own benefit or in some inappropriate manner in violation of some important principle such as trust, privacy or integrity. *As suggested in the last section, particular attention must be paid to this aspect of ethics in this study since I am an employee in the institution that is being studied.* Since the start of this particular study, though I have been very much aware of the possibility, the question of conflict of interest has not arisen. I do recognize that being privy to information gained from the interviews and the documents, I have to be careful in my future interactions with persons inside and outside the University community and do not mention or say anything that could betray the trust that is expected of me. I have not used the information that I gained from the collected data inappropriately and do not intend to do so now that the study has been completed. Ethical issues, therefore, are concerned with obtaining the consent of participants, assuring their confidentiality, preventing bias, maintaining the integrity of the study, and managing conflicts of interest and intrusiveness.

How then did I deal with these ethical issues? The formal letter alluded to above consisted of a description of the research involved and the purpose of the research. Interviewees were asked to sign a copy of the letter giving their consent to be interviewed with the written promise that anything they tell me will be treated confidentially. However, they all indicated that they had no problem whatsoever with being identified with the study. *In an effort to make sure that my acquaintanceship with the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine and its*

programmes did not affect my view of each situation and how I reported it, each interviewee was asked the same questions and verbatim responses were incorporated into the tables that are part of the appendices of this thesis. By doing so, I have created an audit trail so that an interested reader can check for consistency and adequacy of my inferences. Based on a comparison of the verbatim responses and the conclusions drawn, a disinterested reader will be able to deduce whether or not my interpretations are bias free.

Because of the intrusive nature of this study, it was possible that inconsistencies and inaccuracies could have been presented. As far as I could ascertain no inconsistencies and inaccuracies were presented. I came to this conclusion because the documents supported the information shared in the interviews. It was also not necessary in writing up my findings to protect the rights and safeguard the anonymity of my interviewees since as mentioned before they had no problems with associating their identity with my findings.

In conclusion, therefore, I selected the case method research strategy as the best means of addressing the research questions I had designed to test the strength of my case that there was evidence to challenge Clark's assumption about the relationship between minor enclaves and entrepreneurial universities. That case rested on the argument that such 'entrepreneurial enclaves' did exist, and, far from being 'sealed off' from, actually played a part in the transformation of the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine Campus. The research methodology described in this chapter was designed to establish effectively and on a sound basis whether that case had been made. The following chapters describe the findings of that research process.

CHAPTER 4

FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES SUMMER PROGRAMME

As stated in Chapter 3, university files dealing with minutes of meetings and correspondence between the administration and the Faculty of Social Sciences were perused. Relevant documents were chosen as long as they answered or provided information with respect to any of the four research questions. Summaries of these documents form part of the appendices of this thesis. Pertinent information arising from the interview with the Deputy Dean, Student Matters also formed part of the data collected. The findings with respect to this case will be presented. A discussion on the findings will follow and a concluding paragraph on whether or not the findings and discussion advances the theory that university transformation can be successfully driven from a minor enclave will also be provided.

Findings

Research Question 1

In attempting to find the answer to Research Question 1 “Was the Summer Programme recognized as an entrepreneurial unit in its early years and was it intended to be an entrepreneurial unit? “ relevant information was found in ten documents.

Document 1 dealt with a proposal from the Deputy Dean (Student Matters) for a Faculty of Social Sciences Summer Programme. The proposal indicated that a large number of students had failed compulsory first year courses and in the absence of supplemental examinations, an alternative was being proposed at no cost to the University. Document 2 consisted of a budget for the proposed Summer Programme while Document 3 advised that Academic Board had approved the proposal as a pilot project, subject to certain terms and conditions.

However, when the proposal went to the Campus Finance and General Purposes Committee (Document 5), at which budgeted costs and revenues were discussed, concern was expressed at the non-inclusion in the budget of non-Faculty (Campus) costs. The Committee therefore directed that the Faculty should consult

with the Bursar on the Budget for the proposed Summer Programme, prior to its submission to the St. Augustine Planning and Estimates Committee (STAPEC).

Document 8 outlined information that the St. Augustine Planning and Estimates Committee (STAPEC) noted the suggested amendments to the Summer Programme budget, but the Committee also acknowledged that the suggested amendments would not put the programme in deficit. In light of that fact, the Committee approved the Estimates, subject to adequate provision being made for maintenance and examination invigilation. The budget was amended by the Deputy Dean (Student Matters) in keeping with STAPEC's directive to include provision for certain other identifiable costs such as the cleaning of lecture rooms and the possible increase in the sum budgeted for invigilation of examinations (Document 9). Separate accounts (Income, Part-Time Tutors and Office and General Expenses) were opened for the Summer Programme. Confirmation of this was seen in Document 10 in the form of a letter from the Senior Accountant (Budgetary Control) to the Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences.

Lecturers were remunerated separately, apart from their normal salaries, for teaching in the Summer Programme although there was resistance from the Senior Accountant (Salaries and Pensions) who questioned the validity of the contracts between the Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences and the staff members. The Senior Accountant (Salaries and Pensions), as outlined in Document 11, also pointed out that since several of the appointees held full time positions with the University, offering them separate appointments to teach in the Summer Programme was in "direct contradiction to Clause 4 of their contracts of service". He, however, suggested that in order to get around the problem, "the person could be granted local leave, so as to pursue the activity of lecturing in the summer courses".

By the second year, 1993, the Summer Programme was deemed to be a success by Academic Board as reported in Document 14. The Board noted that despite some administrative problems, the Social Sciences Summer programme was a success with a total of 420 students participating in the programme (356 UWI and 64 outsiders). The financial report indicated that total revenue amounted to \$254,000

and a surplus of \$101,000 was realized. By the third year, 1994, the Summer Certificate in Public Administration was advertised (Document 19).

The interview with the then Faculty of Social Sciences Deputy Dean, (Student Matters), Dr. PK also provided evidence of the entrepreneurial nature of the Summer Programme. In response to Interview Question 1 “The official records show that the purpose of the Faculty of Social Sciences Summer Programme was to enable existing students to have an opportunity to repeat failed compulsory first year courses in order to move on with their degree. What is your view?” Dr. PK surmised that while the failing students may have been the target at the time, he was also thinking about people from the outside joining the University. He advised that the real reason for starting the Summer Programme was to get people to pursue Social Sciences courses because of the popularity of the courses. Demand outweighed supply. He was sure that when the plan was formulated “we were really thinking about filling a demand of satisfying persons who were not students in the normal semester”. Dr. PK reiterated that “People used it as an alternative to supplementals. That was fine but from the very beginning it was a programme designed for people who had never done the courses before. That was the plan. So it was never for failed students alone”. The point about no extra cost to the University was also emphasized. Dr. PK advised that for a course to be put on, it had to be considered profitable to do so, or at least a break even situation was envisaged. He went on “That was one of the big arguments we put forward – that it was not going to cost the University anything. So if by chance a compulsory course was not profitable it was not put on”.

With respect to capturing overseas and overseas based Trinidad & Tobago students into the programme, Dr. PK related an anecdote of one lecturer from another Faculty, who continually heaped scorn on the title “Summer Programme” in a tropical country. He advised that his rebuttal was always the same, i.e. that North American students and Trinidadian and Tobagonian students studying in North American Universities, who were home for the holidays would understand the concept and there was a need “to capture that market as well”. Dr. PK went on further, “You see the notion of the thing was to make it acceptable and understandable to people who were already taking part in that kind of exercise. I

was using the language of the market at that time”. Dr. PK ended his response to question 1 with two emphatic statements. “The attractiveness as I said before was to bring people from outside the University into the University and we were able to do that. Failing students were by the way but in a way they ended up as one the biggest catchment to the programme”. However “when I went to Academic Board it was not only for failing students. To tell you the truth it was not only for failing students”.

Research Question 2

A memorandum, Document 4, from the Deputy Dean (Student Matters), Faculty of Social Sciences to the Pro Vice Chancellor, Planning and Development in response to queries he had raised with respect to the Summer Programme provided the first affirmative answer to the second research question, “Were there barriers/obstacles in the creation of an entrepreneurial unit within a traditional university?” The memorandum included, among answers to the several queries, the criteria for admission into the courses.

Evidence of several other obstacles was found in the records. The Campus Finance and General Purposes Committee meeting held on May 1, 1992, at which the Summer Programme budgeted costs and revenues were discussed, expressed concern at the non-inclusion in the budget of non-Faculty (Campus) costs (Document 5). The Faculty quickly obliged with the directive that it should consult with the Bursar on the budget before taking it any further. Provisional acceptance of the Programme was granted by the University Academic Committee (UAC) meeting held on May 7, 1992, (Document 6), subject to the amendment of the Faculty regulations or a proposal from the Faculty to UAC with respect to the question of accrediting the Summer Programme examinations. At the St. Augustine Planning and Estimates Committee meeting held on May 27, 1992 (Document 8), the Estimates for the Summer Programme were approved, subject to adequate provision being made for maintenance and examination invigilation.

The Deputy Dean advised the Assistant Registrar, Student Affairs (Admissions) in a memorandum dated May 11, 1993 (Document 12) that the Faculty was taking

full charge of the exercise, as it had done the year before. However, Academic Board, at its meeting on June 3, 1993 (Document 13), after hearing from the Deputy Dean that no formal registration procedures were in place for enrolling non-UWI participants in the Summer Programme, directed the Faculty, in consultation with the Campus Registrar and the Head, Computer Centre to determine an appropriate registration status for non-UWI participants. The Board also directed the Faculty to consider the issue of an appropriate statement to those participants who successfully complete the courses and the issue of whether the passes could be used as credits for persons wishing to pursue degree/certificate programmes in the future.

The Assistant Registrars, Student Affairs (Admissions and Examinations) placed on record, by means of memoranda, the visit by Ms. VM to their respective offices (Documents 15 and 16). The Assistant Registrar, Student Affairs (Admissions) sought clarification of Ms. M's status and took the opportunity to advise the Dean and Deputy Dean on Admissions matters pertaining to the Summer Programme. The Assistant Registrar, Student Affairs (Examinations) advised the Dean and Deputy Dean that Ms. M had introduced herself as the Administrative Assistant/Public Relations Officer for the 1994 Summer Programme in the Faculty of Social Sciences and went on to record in her memorandum comments and recommendations she had made to Ms. M, particularly with respect to examination matters.

The Faculty continued on its mission to expand the Summer Programme and in that regard sought Academic Board's approval (Document 17) for:

- (i) the amendment of Faculty Regulations for Specially Admitted and Occasional Students to permit the admission of matriculable students not yet registered for a Degree Programme who would be referred to as "Summer Students";
- (ii) regularization of the status of Summer Students who were not currently registered in the normal year long programme to permit them to become bona fide UWI students, thereby enabling them

- access to the University's facilities during the summer, as well as entitling them to receive their credits on transcripts;
- (iii) automatic entry of Summer Students to the full time programme at Level II once they have completed ten Level 1 courses.

Academic Board commended the Faculty for the initiative in seeking to expand its Summer Programme but noting a Consultant's report on Summer Programmes and related discussions at the Board for Distance Education, questioned whether the time was opportune to proceed with the proposed changes in the regulations.

The Faculty continued in its quest for full approval of the Summer Programme. At a University Academic Committee meeting on May 6, 1994 which focused on the proposed Summer Term and the Summer Programme (Document 18), the University Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences informed the meeting that while there was substantial agreement on rules that should govern such a school in the Faculty, there was disagreement on one policy issue which was to what extent the Summer School should be approved as institutionally integrated into the regular University operations. The University Dean was, therefore, advised to send the draft regulations to all Faculties at the St. Augustine Campus, to Campus Principals, to the Office of Academic Affairs, to the Chair, Board for Examinations and to the Standing Committee on Ordinances and Regulations.

Despite obstacles and challenges with respect to approval of new regulations and the formulation of new policy, the Programme met its commitments with respect to the transfer of funds for the payment of Library Staff as a result of opening hours in the summer, similar to the opening hours during the two semesters. Verification of this is found in a memorandum (Document 26) dated June 29, 1995 from the Senior Accountant (Budgets) to the Deputy Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences advising that, as requested, the sum of \$30,000 had been transferred from the Faculty's Summer Programme account to the Library Reserve Account. The Senior Accountant (Budgets) also informed the Campus Librarian (Document 27) by memorandum dated June 29, 1995 that a new reserve account for the grants from the Social Sciences Summer Programme had been opened. She

further advised that the weekly allowances paid to the Library staff would be allocated to that account.

The Assistant Registrar, Student Affairs (Examinations) continued to send out yearly reminders to the Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences with respect to examination matters. In a memorandum dated November 10, 1995 (Document 28) she reminded the Dean, (formerly the Deputy Dean, who was appointed Dean, with effect from August 1, 1995) of examination matters and advised on steps that should be taken with respect to students from other Faculties pursuing Social Sciences Summer Programme courses.

The Dean, in his response (Document 29) dated November 16, 1995, to the Assistant Registrar, Student Affairs (Examinations) assured her that the Faculty would take steps to deal with the matters raised. However, with particular reference to the point about “Students from Other Faculties” the Dean wrote in part:

The faculty will advise such students that they should seek prior approval from their Faculties before registering, if their intention is to have the Faculty of Social Sciences courses count for credit, The Faculty will not, however, make such approval a pre-requisite to registration in its courses.

Dr. PK’s response to Interview Question 2 “Did you encounter any obstacles or resistance in achieving your goal of setting up the Summer Programme?” provided definite answers to Research Question 2. He explained that the first set of obstacles came about because of the interpretation that the Summer Programme was a substitute for supplemental examinations. “The resistance I got was from people who thought it was vulgar, that it was a programme that seemed to be making money off the students”. He further explained that at Academic Board “some of the arguments that were put forward were that having shut down the supplementals, Social Sciences was now formulating a programme which seemed to be the reintroduction of the supplementals through the backdoor and [they were]charging money for it.”

Dr. PK advised that the second set of resistance came from persons within the Faculty who were of the view that the programme would involve extra work and as such money was demanded up front. He explained that because of such up front demands he adopted a form of behaviour to suit the situation and brought on board an assertive Administrative Assistant to manage the programme. “I use to get on real bad sometimes In fact that was one of the reasons I later brought on Ms. VM to manage the programme; it was precisely because she was an abrasive woman. I figured she could get on like me.”

The third set of resistance, he claimed came from the Assistant Registrar, Student Affairs (Examinations), the Senior Assistant Registrar, Student Affairs (Admissions) and a senior member of staff in the Economics department. “When I tell you, there was resistance all round, there was resistance at the level of the Examinations Section..... there was a general feeling from the administration especially the then Senior Assistant Registrar, Student Affairs (Admissions) that the programme would not work even people in my own department (Economics), example TF who felt that it was not going to work. But the thing worked. I think it was a business opportunity just waiting to be ignited”.

“The obstacles did not come only in the initial year” Dr. PK reported. There were demands for separate payment for every duty associated with the programme in the early years. He indicated that he had absolutely no problem with the various demands but “there was a kind of sabotaging going on, almost a kind of aggressiveness towards getting rid of the programme in the long run. So I overcame it at our level (Faculty) by paying and within the University system, I actually worked out a programme where people would be paid”. With respect to Library services, he reported that although he had asked for additional services only in the Social Sciences section, the Library authorities decided to extend the additional services to the whole library: “So it meant that whereas we were paying for it anybody could come in to the Library and use it. This meant that other Library staff then started approaching me for additional income. I cannot remember all the details but I know we resolved it by making a block grant to the Library who paid their staff.”

Dr. PK identified the fifth obstacle as simply resistance to change: “There was, like in any other situation, anytime people see something new, the first thing they say is No, that cannot work because they like what they are accustomed to, they have a comfort zone, they don’t want to change.”

The sixth obstacle encountered was the initial refusal to admit into the University, someone who had completed nine first year courses in the Summer Programme. There was prejudice against someone coming in through the back door. “When CD applied to enter the University to pursue a degree programme the Assistant Registrar, Students Affairs (Admissions) kept telling me that she should go and do A-Levels. I was so upset about that. If somebody could do first year courses without A-Levels why should they be told that they must do A-Levels to be more competitive in gaining entry. It was so stupid. So CD had finished nine courses and they did not want to admit her because she was not as ‘qualified’ as other applicants.” She was eventually admitted into the second year of the degree programme in Management Studies. Dr. PK advised “Eventually I won because common sense prevailed and I was happy for that because she was the first, probably the only one to date who came straight from the Summer programme and actually went on to the Masters degree in Management Studies.

In answering Interview Question 5 “Did you at any time feel intimidated by anyone at any level of University administration?” Dr. PK again provided definite answers to Research Question 2. His response was “Personally no. I don’t let anybody intimidate me. Some people had a problem based on jealousy that we were making this kind of money and they challenged why we should keep that money, you see they felt that money should come to the coffers of the University and so on.” He went on, “I cannot remember anybody threatening me or trying to intimidate me or anything like that. People were obstructionists rather than intimidatory.”

Research Question 3

The findings with respect to Research Question 3, “What is the relationship between an entrepreneurial unit within a traditional university and policy formulation”, provided evidence suggesting that new policy was formulated and

highlighted the absence of relevant policy to deal with the birth of the Summer Programme. Academic Board directed the Faculty of Social Sciences to consider the issue of an appropriate statement to those participants who had successfully completed the courses, to consider whether the passes could be used as credits for persons wishing to pursue degree/certificate programmes in the future, and to consult with the Registrar and the Head of the Computer Centre to determine an appropriate registration status for non-UWI participants in the Programme (Document 13).

In 1994, in response to the Faculty's request to expand the Summer Programme (Document 17), Academic Board alluded to the possibility of new policy with respect to Summer Programmes when they questioned whether it was an opportune time to approve new policy requests in light of its consideration of a Consultant's report on Summer Programmes and Distance Education. However, the Board agreed that Level II and III courses could be offered to qualified students for one year in the first instance, subject to satisfactory prior arrangements being made in accordance with the prescribed examination regulations.

There was evidence of disagreement in the formulation of new policy which is recorded in Document 18. The University Dean reported to University Academic Committee in May 1994 that while there was substantial agreement on the governing rules, there was disagreement on one policy issue which was to what extent the Summer School should be approved as institutionally integrated into the regular University operations.

The absence of policy with respect to appeal against Summer Programme Examination results was highlighted in a memorandum from the Deputy Dean (Students Matters) to the Campus Principal (Document 21). He advised the Principal that "there is no procedure as yet in place to allow students enrolled in the Summer Programme to appeal against examination results" and sought the permission to use the existing regulations that were in place for regular students.

Policy, as far as income distribution was concerned, was formulated in June 1995 (Document 24). The University Finance and General Purposes Committee agreed with a recommendation from the Office of Planning and Development outlined in its paper on the Guidelines for Fees and Incomes from Summer Courses that the bulk of the income earned through those offerings should accrue to the Faculties and Departments. This approval validated the actions of the Head, Department of Management Studies in September, 1994, and the Head, Department of Economics and the Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences in January, 1995. The Head, Department of Management Studies informed her staff that the cost of replacing the carpet in the Management Lecture Theatre was charged against the expected proceeds from the surplus of the 1994 Summer Programme (Document 20). The Head of the Department of Economics advised the Bursar to pay the expenses incurred in carrying out the Department's retreat from the proceeds of the funds allocated to the department from the Summer Programme income (Document 22) while the Dean responded positively to a request from a junior member of staff for financial help to attend a Salzburg Seminar by using Summer Programme funds (Document 23). The approval of the income distribution policy was followed up with a Memorandum of Understanding between the Bursary and the Faculty of Social Sciences (Document 25).

Dr. PK, in response to Question 4 "Was there a need for new policy to deal with the birth of the Summer Programme for example the application by CD for entry into the B.Sc. programme?" did not agree that policy formulation was needed to allow for the admittance of CD. He felt that CD's application for entry into the B.Sc. programme could have been considered using the then existing Challenge Programme policy. However, he identified the need for clear policy with respect to the Summer Certificate in Public Administration students. He advised that the "students who came in that programme were bona fide UWI students but you had the special statute that they were Summer students. Something had to be worked out for instance so that they would not crowd up the place during the non summer months." Eventually, he concluded a set of rules regarding summer registration was formulated.

In response to Question 5 “What do you think accounted for the success of the Summer Certificate in Public Administration?” Dr. PK advised that the policy of the non involvement of the Government in the programme enabled anybody to pursue the programme. “You did not have to be chosen by the Government (who granted time off for attendees [in the year long programme]. You simply signed up and did it during the summer period. To tell you the truth we did not limit it to public servants”.

Research Question 4

Research Question 4 asked the question “Does leadership play a role in driving entrepreneurialism from a minor enclave? Information identified with a view to answering that question was found in Document 20, which was a memorandum from the Head of the Department of Management Studies to her colleagues in the department advising them that Heads of Departments in the Faculty had agreed that a full scale plan for rationalizing the Summer Programme would be developed under the leadership of the Deputy Dean.

Another relevant bit of information was found in Document 29 in the form of a memorandum from the Dean (formerly Deputy Dean) advising the Assistant Registrar, Student Affairs (Examinations) that while he was prepared to advise students from other Faculties that they should seek the approval from their Faculties before registering, he was adamant “the Faculty will not, however, make such approval a pre-requisite to registration in its courses”.

The responses to the questions posed to Dr. PK clearly portrayed his leadership skills. He was able to cope and deal with the resistance and obstacles because he was aware that people generally preferred to stay with what they were accustomed to but usually eventually relented when they got used to the new idea. As well, he was aware that in order to capture new markets he had to use language that was familiar to potential students. He was also willing to share his ideas with other Faculties. When the Summer Programme spread to other Faculties but did not have the early successes as the Social Sciences programme had, he advised them to “try a new initiative and present the courses in a different way”. He was also

knowledgeable. He was so familiar with existing University regulations that he successfully used it in his arguments in the CD case.

With respect to how the profits of the programme should be distributed, he was adamant that it should be left up to the Faculty to determine how and when it should be spent. He explained that he “never had a problem with giving the University its due, I had a problem with them telling me how to spend the money”. He further explained that he toned down a bit when he became familiar with corporate governance, “but I certainly never toned down our right to retain a large amount of money because that was our initiative, our business, we could shut it down in the morning if we wanted to and nobody could fault us for that”. His persistence won out when the University administration formulated acceptable guidelines on the distribution of income from Summer Programmes.

Finally, he was forward thinking. He saw the benefits for prospective students and the Faculty in the long run. The positive outcomes as a result of the Summer Certificate in Public Administration attested to this. The financial gains from that programme boost the overall profits and the students gained on two counts. “It gave people a University qualification and it also gave people who did not have A-levels a certification that would allow them to come to do a degree programme.”

Discussion

Using the findings outlined earlier, I will now discuss the extent to which they have answered the Research Questions in relation to the literature reviewed.

1. Was the Summer Programme recognized as an entrepreneurial unit in its early years and was it intended to be an entrepreneurial unit??

There was some contradiction with the information gained from the documents and the interview with Dr. PK with respect to the reason for the Summer Programme. The official documents indicated that the main reason was to facilitate students who had failed compulsory courses. Dr. PK acknowledged that

reason but adamantly indicated that he had a much broader and long term vision in mind. However, both sources of information corroborated the fact that the unit was indeed entrepreneurial based on its innovative nature, and its ability to direct and sustain itself.

“Entrepreneurial universities seek to become ‘stand-up’ universities that are significant actors on their own terms” (Clark, 1998). The Faculty of Social Sciences Summer Programme, based on the findings, sought and became a ‘stand-up’ unit, the entrepreneurial arm of the Faculty of Social Sciences within The University of the West Indies, St. Augustine. Despite resistance and several obstacles the unit was and continues to be a significant actor on its own terms. This fact is supported by Dr. PK who advised that “I certainly never toned down our right to retain a large amount of money because that was our initiative, our business, we could shut it down in the morning if we wanted to and nobody could fault us for that”.

It would seem therefore, that the top university administrators at that time did not officially recognize the Summer Programme as entrepreneurial but by their insistence that the programme should incur no cost to the University, they actually forced it to be entrepreneurial. On the other hand, the Deputy Dean, by the evidence provided in his interview clearly intended the programme to be entrepreneurial from the very beginning.

2. Were there barriers/obstacles in the creation of an entrepreneurial unit within a traditional university?

Information gained from the official documents and the interview with Dr. PK attest to the fact that there were several obstacles and resistance during the early years of the programme. Shattock (2003) advised that the present era, in which market forces and competition among institutions characterizes the higher education system, “favours institutions which can chart a distinctive course which is less reliant on the state, flexible in seizing opportunities and ambitious for institutional advancement.” The findings with respect to research question 2

corroborate Shattock's theory "that there are some intrinsic inhibitions which prevent some universities becoming entrepreneurial".

Among the inhibitions Shattock identified was organizational culture and tradition. Dr. PK reported that initial resistance at Academic Board was as a result of the feeling by some members of the board that "it was vulgar, that it was a programme that seemed to be making money off the students". Based on the findings, I am of the view that, while the individual resistance to the change stemmed from having to deal with the existence of a new entity, the Summer Programme, which corroborates Robbins' (1993) view that resistance could be displayed if there is interference with what she/he is accustomed to, the root of most of the obstacles/resistance lay in the traditional culture of the University of the West Indies.

An understanding of the traditional culture in universities could be found in a statement made by Cangemi (1975, p. 229): "The aims of business and education are different. Business is profit oriented and materialistic, while education is dedicated to humanity, broadly speaking". Thirty-one years later, not much has changed as noted in a statement by the last Campus Principal of the St. Augustine Campus, who served the University in that capacity from September 2001 to July 2007. In one of his weekly columns in one of the national newspapers, he commented that:

It is one thing, however, to start an educational enterprise and run it according to sound business principles; it is another thing to transform a traditional educational institution, in which significant groups of key players view business and education as being antithetical to each other, into an enterprising educational business (Tewarie, 2006).

In this particular case, however, the persistence displayed by the leader of the Summer Programme helped the unit to rise above the obstacles and the initial resistance.

3. What is the relationship between an entrepreneurial unit within in a traditional university and policy formulation?

The official documents and the interview unearthed the fact that new policy had to be formulated because of the birth of the Summer Programme which brought with it new situations. Some of the new situations were envisaged and planned for while, at least in one case, the absence of appropriate regulations with respect to appeal of summer results, nothing was in place. The Deputy Dean realizing that he was dealing with more consumer oriented students (full fee paying students) quickly rose to the occasion. He implored the Campus Principal to use the existing appeal mechanism “in order not to make the Summer Programme appear as lacking in legitimacy”. Appropriate regulations were eventually formulated.

Another major source of concern was how revenue earned from the Programme should be distributed. Before the Summer Programme, this was not an issue since the source of all funding came mainly from the Governments. Two Heads of Departments and the Dean, before the official policy was formulated, used some of the profits to replace the carpet in one of its lecture theatres, to fund a departmental retreat, and to assist a junior member of staff to attend a prestigious international seminar. Eventually, these actions were legitimized with the formulation of a revenue policy.

Davies (1987, p. 26) posited that the entrepreneurial and adaptive university (EAU) was a complex and messy organization since “it does not sit easily within a narrow set of regulatory prescriptions”. However, he concluded that:

once the process of launching various elements of EAU has commenced, it is extraordinarily difficult to stop it, given the increased reliance on additional income; the culture and expectations developed internally and externally; and the effect on government thinking and attitudes towards universities.

Clark (1998, p. 5) supported that view. He posited that:

Effective collective entrepreneurship does not carry a university beyond the boundaries of academic legitimacy, setting off a down-market cycle of reputation, resources, and development. Rather, it can provide resources and infrastructure that build capability beyond what a university would otherwise have, thereby allowing it to subsidize and enact an up-market climb in quality and reputation.

The benefits of entrepreneurship are tremendous but clear ground rules must be developed to legitimately deal with all the new situations that will develop as a result of that movement. I am of the view, therefore, that there is a direct link between entrepreneurialism and policy formulation. By eventually agreeing that changes in policy were necessary and by going a step further in formulating new policy provided evidence that transformation, as far as policy matters were concerned, was taking place at the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine Campus.

4. Does leadership play a role in driving entrepreneurialism from a minor enclave?

An entrepreneurial movement, as evidenced in the case of the Faculty of Social Sciences Summer Programme, may not always begin with the leader clearly articulating his entrepreneurial motives and objectives.

Townsend and Bassoppo-Moyo (1997) posited that knowledge, skills and attitudes (in that order) were essential requirements for an effective academic administrator, however, Ball (2004) argued that the emphasis should be placed on attitude since that element distinguishes between management and leadership. The findings show that the entrepreneurial leader, Dr. PK was not only strategic, but fearless and bold. His attitude to the whole process was systematic. He presented his proposal; when approval was granted, despite the initial stumbling blocks, he implemented his strategy and responded to operational challenges by advocating policy formulation.

The timeliness of his responses to the operational challenges conforms to the argument put forward by Davies et al (2001, p. 1025) that “models of governance based on the notion of collegiality do not sit comfortably with pressures from customers who expect a business-like response in dynamic situations”. The findings, as well give credence to the Davies et al (2001, p. 1026) theory that “leadership was needed to combine the collegiality ethos of universities with the responsive, business-like approach demanded by customers”. Dr. PK, from the evidence, seemed to have bridged the gap and brought together “the traditional purpose of the University and the latter day imperatives to stability and survival” (Davies et al (2001, p. 1087) which seems to be an essential ingredient in the transformation of a traditional university into an entrepreneurial and adaptive university. Clearly then, leadership plays a role in driving entrepreneurship within a traditional university and an even more vital role in driving entrepreneurship from a minor enclave in that environment.

Davies (1987), Clark (1998) and Shattock (2003) all agreed that in order for higher education institutions to survive they must become entrepreneurial. However, Clark (1998, p. 4), theorized that “transformation occurs when a number of individuals come together in university basic units and across a university over a number of years to change, by means of organized initiative, how the institution is structured and oriented”. He is of the view that collective action is the key to success. He therefore dismissed the idea of entrepreneurialism driven by innovative programmes, like the Faculty of Social Sciences Summer Programme. The phenomenon of the programme, though, advances my theory that entrepreneurialism can be successfully driven from minor enclaves. However, one of the main ingredients is persistent, fearless, intuitive leadership. One of the main criticisms leveled at Clark (1998) was that he did not outline how traditional universities could be transformed into entrepreneurial universities. It might be possible for such universities to be constructed, using as their building blocks, several minor enclaves within the organization. The findings of the four other case studies will help in ascertaining whether such an approach is the key to the elusive question.

CHAPTER 5

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND EDUCATION SUMMER PROGRAMME

As in the previous chapter, a similar approach using documents and interview data, was undertaken in an effort to determine whether or not the Faculty of Humanities and Education Summer Programme was entrepreneurial in nature, bearing in mind Rinne and Koivula's (2005) definition of an entrepreneurial university: "entrepreneurial action, structures and attitude in a university", whether that Unit encountered similar barriers and obstacles to the ones encountered by the Faculty of Social Sciences Summer Programme and the extent to which existing policy was reevaluated and new ones implemented. Evidence of the extent to which leadership played a part in the development and growth of the unit was also sought.

Findings

Research Question 1

Pertinent information with respect to Research Question 1 "Why and how was each unit created and was each one entrepreneurial in nature from its very beginning?" was found in six documents and in responses from Mr. VS who was the Dean of the Faculty during the period when the programme started. The Assistant Registrar, Student Affairs (Admissions) wrote to the Dean of the Faculty in June 1998 advising that she understood that certain departments in the Faculty were planning to run summer courses in the summer of 1998. She requested as a matter of urgency a list of the courses that were being run and the names of students who had been accepted to read the courses. In her memorandum she emphasized that the Admissions section "must have **all** the information concerning students registered on the campus" (Document 10). This memorandum came after the Assistant Registrar, Student Affairs, (Admissions) and the Assistant Registrar (Examinations) were informed by the coordinator of the Linguistics section that the section had agreed to teach a particular course in the summer and that the Dean had approved that decision on behalf of Faculty Board. The coordinator also advised that the computer centre had informed the department that registration should be internal to the Department and advised on

the need to schedule the examination during the summer course examination period. (Document 11)

In 2001 Academic Board approved the ‘cautious’ expansion of the Faculty’s “mid-year” programme. An advertisement appeared in the local newspapers which showed that English Language (Foundation) courses, History courses and Language, Linguistics & Literature courses were to be offered that year. The advertisement also advised of the names of persons for each set of courses to whom queries should be addressed (Documents 14 & 15).

By 2003, the outgoing Deputy Dean, Distance and Outreach through a memorandum to the Dean dated August 8th (Document 18) provided a summary report on the 2003 summer programme. Among other things she advised that the programme had expanded again that year with a total of 18 courses which were offered to approximately 460 students. She also advised that for the first time students from foreign universities were admitted and that those students would transfer credits gained from the summer programme to their home programmes. With respect to projections for the future, she advised that there were plans to offer more courses in 2004, that there were plans to take in more students from foreign universities, both individually and as a group and that the costs for such groups needed to be standardized. She further advised that there were plans to offer a programme in Tobago (sister isle) the following year as part of the first year pilot project there. Document 19 provided information that further expansion took place in 2004. Twenty-seven courses were offered in the summer of that year.

In response to Interview Questions 1 and 2, “Why did the programme start?” and “How did the programme start?” the then Dean of the Faculty, Mr. VS advised that one of the main reasons for the establishment of the programme was to facilitate throughput and to give students an opportunity to recover before the next academic year. He also advised that “we were a little jealous of the kinds of returns we saw coming to the Faculty of Social Sciences who as far as I remember had pioneered the summer school operations and they had been providing themselves as it were with surpluses, operating surpluses which my Faculty did

not have”. He explained that the programme started with volunteers from the departments and the Faculty and that part time staff and post graduate students were the persons who actually carried the programme in its early years.

In response to question 5 “Did you feel that you had the full support of the university administration during the start up and early years of the programme”? Mr. VS explained that the Faculty saw the programme as an experiment which they were doing virtually on their own and as such did not expect full support from the administration. He also confirmed that full support was not always forthcoming during those early days. With respect to the profits from the programme, Mr. VS advised that allocations went to the departments and facilitated expansion in various ways. He elaborated in his responses to Question 7, “What have been the main successes of the programme?” that the expansion of the faculty included the use of the funds to hire extra part-time assistance for the regular staff during semesters 1 and 2; the purchase of equipment, in particular computers, because at that time the provisions for computers were very, very limited; and the provision of extra funds to full-time members of staff to attend more international conferences. The fact that the clientele for their summer programme were school teachers who found it easier to attend classes during the summer was also cited among the successes of the programme, since teachers formed a huge percentage of part-time students during the regular semesters.

The then Dean also cited the “good impression” that the existence of the programme provided as another success of the programme. He advised that it gave the external community the feeling that the University’s resources were deployed for most of the year and that “we did not shut the place down here for a particular time in the year”. He reiterated as well that the success enjoyed by Social Sciences had always been and continues to be an incentive but what was a greater incentive was the fact that resources during that period were stretched and, therefore, the income from the programme was more than welcome.

Research Question 2

In attempting to find the answer to Research Question 2 “What barriers/obstacles were encountered in the creation of each entrepreneurial unit within the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine Campus?” relevant information was found in Documents 22 and 23 and in the responses from the interview with Mr. VS.

At a meeting of Faculty Board on November 2, 1993 the Department of History communicated to the Board that there was consensus that the department was not supportive of the establishment of a Summer Programme in the Faculty since it was unreasonable to expect full time staff to teach in the summer in view of a greatly increased teaching load, the greater expectations for research output as a condition of promotion, and the extreme difficulty in getting sabbatical or research leave at St. Augustine. It was felt also that even if funds were available to pay part-time staff (tutors, post graduates) to teach courses in the summer, full-time staff would still have to undertake administrative, monitoring and examination responsibilities during that period (Document 22).

The Department of Language and Linguistics was also not supportive of a Summer Programme. It argued that for reasons connected with the academic integrity of lecturers, as well as the question of assessment and promotions, it was essential for free time to be provided for research, and that such free time was diminishing as a result of the semester system (Document 23). Similar views, as will be seen when the findings of the Faculty of Science and Agriculture Summer Programme and the Continuing Engineering Education Centre cases are presented, were expressed by staff members in other Faculties since a ‘strong publication record’ seemed to be the most important factor as far as assessment and promotion at the University was concerned (Ordinance 8).

In response to interview question 2 “How did the programme start? Mr. VS responded that the programme was run by mostly part-time staff and graduate students. He advised that in the early stages there was no participation from many of the regular academics because they saw the summer programme as encroaching upon the period they had for their own research and for travel abroad. They held this view even though early in the programme there was an understanding that

they would be compensated additionally. Many academics, especially the senior ones, felt that the compensation was inadequate and so were not a part of the programme. Mr. VS also advised that there was also strong resistance from the language teachers to be a part of the programme. Their resistance stemmed from the fact that language courses had a series of in-course tests so that you move progressively from one point to the next. They were of the view that five or six weeks were too short a period to carry out their programme.

In response to interview question 3 “What were the obstacles preceding the birth and in the early years of the programme? How did you overcome them and did new ones arise?” Mr. VS reiterated the resistance among senior staff who insisted that it was an infringement upon their free time and that the compensation was inadequate. He reported that running the programme was cumbersome, that problems were anticipated, that there indeed were many problems but he classified them as minor and indicated that within two or three years of the start of the programme many of them were resolved. He was sure that coming after Social Sciences helped in resolving some of the issues. One of the issues that caused strong resistance among the staff was the name “Summer”. When the University through the Board for Undergraduate Studies decided to confer the title “Summer School” there was resistance among the staff, especially the creative writers. Staff members openly argued that there was no summer in the Caribbean. In responding to interview question 8 “What do you think were the factors that led to these successes?” Mr. VS explained that in the Faculty the programme was called the “Mid-Year Programme” initially until the University in its wisdom instructed that the word “Summer” would replace it. It was endorsed by the then Vice Chancellor who was seeing the Summer School at the University of the West Indies as a source of considerable attraction for North American students. It should be recalled that the Deputy Dean, Student Matters in the Faculty of Social Sciences envisaged that such students constituted a market to be captured.

Research Question 3

The findings with respect to Research Question 3 “What is the relationship between the entrepreneurial units within the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine and policy formulation?” showed that new policies and processes were

established. Academic Board agreed with the Faculty's recommendation that registration in a summer programme must be with the approval of the Faculty in which the student was officially registered (Document 24). Mr. VS who was a member of the Board for Undergraduate Studies during the early years of his faculty's summer programme advised that the Board considered and eventually amended the regulations with respect to the period of time that students must spend at the University before they are allowed to graduate. The regulation stated that in order to graduate from the institution students must be registered at the institution for at least two years. However, a loop hole existed in the sense that students would spend two years and two summers (one at the beginning of the first year and another at the end of the second year) and that would be seen as equivalent to three years (the time required to complete a full degree). The Board therefore virtually had no choice in amending the regulations.

With respect to the policy of providing financial information on the activities of the Summer Programme within a reasonable timeframe after teaching and examinations had ended the Senior Accountant (Budgets) wrote to the Dean of the Faculty in January 2002 advising that there was a need for cooperation in certain areas to effectively do so (Document 16). She advised that some of the problems were:

- (i) the fact that students did not always identify the faculty where courses were taken
- (ii) late submission of claims for teaching

She recommended that each faculty be assigned a unique colour for Summer School registration forms which should clearly indicate the account number to which the income should be allocated. A cut off-date of mid-July for refunds of fees to students was also recommended. With respect to expenditure, she advised that claims for teaching in the summer programme should be submitted in a timely manner. The end of August of each year was the suggested date.

Because of the proliferation of summer programmes on the campus the Bursary in an effort to ensure accurate financial records, instituted a three-part deposit slip. A memorandum dated April 19, 2005 (Document 20) from the Senior Accountant

(Treasury and Investments) to the Dean, Faculty of Humanities and Education advised him of the enclosed three-part slips for distribution to students in his Faculty. She advised that the new system required the Faculty to give the new deposit slips to the student after the completion of the registration form and agreement of the applicable fees.

Information with respect to new policy as far as library staff was concerned surfaced in a memorandum dated March 7, 2005 (Document 21) from the Librarian attached to the School of Education Library to the Head, School of Education advising that during the summer school in 2004 the library remained open until 9.00 p.m. Monday to Thursday to facilitate summer students. She indicated that that was made possible with the agreement to give library staff overtime payments. She therefore requested a similar arrangement for 2005. Her request was subsequently approved after a reminder memorandum dated March 31, 2005.

Research Question 4

In attempting to answer Research Question 4 “Did leadership play a role in driving entrepreneurialism in each unit” information on the nature and type of leadership was found in four Documents and in responses to the interview questions from Mr. VS. A committee to oversee the summer programme in the faculty was established along with the many other traditional committees for the 1997/1998 academic year (Document 25). The four-member committee consisted of a chairman and one representative from each of the three departments in the faculty. There is evidence to suggest that information on courses to be offered were sent directly to the administration by each department and not through the committee. The administration was advised of linguistic courses to be offered in the summer of 1998 by the coordinator of the Linguistics section of the Department of Language and Linguistics (Document 11) in a memorandum to the Assistant Registrar, Student Affairs (Admissions) and Assistant Registrar, Student Affairs (Examinations). The Coordinator advised of the course to be offered, informed that the Dean had approved the course on behalf of the Faculty Board, that arrangements with the computer centre had been made and the need by the

examinations section to have the course scheduled in the summer course examination period.

In 1999 notification of the courses to be offered by the Centre for Language Learning during the summer was sent by the Director of the Centre to the Bursar (Document 12). The Bursar's advice was also sought with respect to the fees that should be charged. In June of that same year, the coordinator of the University English Language courses wrote to the Assistant Registrar, Student Affairs (Examinations) advising her of the courses to be offered during the vacation programme (June 14 to July 23, 1999) by the Department of Liberal Arts (Document 13). She further advised that since the final examination for one of the courses was an official university examination the question paper would be forwarded to the Examinations Section in the near future. The Coordinator also promised to make available the list of students registered for the courses.

Mr. VS reported in his interview that he knew that the Faculty of Social Sciences had a Summer Programme office very early in its existence but that his faculty did not have an office until the 2004/2005 academic year. The programme was run out of the Dean's Office with the help of the single Administrative Assistant in the faculty, Mrs. JA. In response to interview question 9 "Are there any other thoughts about the programme that you would like to share with me?" Mr. VS advised that the responsibility for the running of the programme eventually shifted to Office of the Deputy Dean (Distance Education and Outreach) and that there has been a series of problems as a result of such a move. One of these was the problem encountered by members of staff with respect to payment for work done in the summer which has led to certain members of staff pulling out completely from the summer programme. Mr. VS countered that the general feeling was that "if you have delivered a programme and you feel that you have not been compensated it's unlikely that you would participate any further."

Discussion

I will now discuss the extent to which the findings outlined above have answered the Research Questions in relation to the literature reviewed.

1. Why and how was each unit created and was each one entrepreneurial in nature from its very beginning?

The two sources of data (the interview and the documents) provide information indicating that the Humanities and Education Summer Programme was entrepreneurial in nature from the very beginning. Mr. VS indicated that the official reason for the programme was to facilitate throughput and to give students an opportunity to recover from failure before the beginning of the next academic year. However, he confessed that his faculty was aware of the returns that Social Sciences was enjoying which provided them with operating surpluses, surpluses that his Faculty did not have at a time when resources in the institution was stretched. At the start therefore, the aim of the programme was not only to break even but to be profitable. Coming after Social Sciences it was not entirely innovative but it was certainly able to direct and sustain itself.

The data also showed that the Faculty saw their programme as a kind of experiment and did not from the very beginning expect support from the administration. However, evidence from the Documents indicated that over a period of five years the programme enjoyed continued growth. The number of courses increased, the clientele moved from only local students to the admission of foreign students from other universities and the profits grew. The faculty was therefore enjoying income from a source other than what was allocated to it. The income generated was used to provide additional staff for the regular semesters, equipment, especially computers and enhanced staff benefits in the form of additional funding to attend international conferences abroad. The Faculty of Humanities and Education Summer programme, therefore, became the entrepreneurial arm of the Faculty.

2. What barriers/obstacles were encountered in the creation of each entrepreneurial unit within the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine Campus?

The findings with respect to Research Question 2 corroborate the theory espoused by Shattock (2003, p. 154) “that there are some intrinsic inhibitions which prevent

some universities becoming entrepreneurial”. In the case of the Humanities and Education Summer Programme the identifiable barriers/obstacles were the name “Summer Programme”, opposition from senior staff members with respect to the use of their non- teaching time and inadequate compensation and resistance from language teachers for their courses to be a part of the programme.

Shattock identified organizational culture and tradition as one of the inhibitions. In the Caribbean in general and in Trinidad and Tobago in particular there are two seasons, the rainy season and the dry season. Summer and winter do not form part of the local vocabulary as far as the weather is concerned. The creative writers in the Faculty vehemently opposed the term “Summer” and as such preferred to identify the programme as the “Mid-Year” programme. As far as they were concerned they could not conceive of identifying a programme with a name that did not fit in culturally or seasonally with a country in the Caribbean.

Traditionally, especially before the semester system, academics used the months between academic years i.e. July August and September to concentrate on their research and their writing. There was therefore a negative reaction to what they perceived to be an encroachment on that time. There was no evidence to suggest any kind of compromise so that the programme could be supported in light of the fact that staff members were benefiting from income from the programme.

As far as the language teachers were concerned, the structuring of their programme was linked to a specific time frame. They were not prepared to change or to make room for change. Their behaviour is synonymous with the views outlined by Robbins (1993) that individual resistance to change could be displayed if individuals feel threatened because of the fear of the unknown, economic factors, or interference with what she/he is accustomed to.

3. What is the relationship between the entrepreneurial units within the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine and policy formulation?

Information from the Documents and the interview provided evidence of the policies and processes that had to be revised and changed in order to deal with the

new situations that presented themselves. The changes took place with the input from the Faculty, Bursary and the Board for Undergraduate Studies. The Faculty found itself in a situation where its own students were pursuing courses in summer programmes run by other faculties and as such had to find a way of monitoring such activity. They were able to get Academic Board to rule that registration in a summer programme must be with the approval of the Faculty in which the student was officially registered. Because of the Summer Programme, the School of Education library maintained hours more in keeping with regular term times in order to facilitate the summer students with the agreement that overtime payment would be made to the staff involved. As far as the Bursary was concerned they had to come up with processes and new documents (forms) to help them in providing accurate financial reports for each faculty's summer programme.

The Board for Undergraduate Studies was forced into amending regulations with respect to the length of time that students must spend at the institution in order to graduate. The students had already begun to use a loop hole in the law so the Board eventually did not have much of a choice but to revisit and amend the regulations to satisfy the needs of the new clientele.

All the changes described above are in keeping with the views espoused by (Davies 1987, p. 15) that the adaptive aspect of the entrepreneurial and adaptive university demanded constant contact with what was taking place in the environment. He argued that it involved

especially in turbulent times, a careful scanning of environmental stimuli of a political, social and economic nature, and adjusting the activities, operations and mission of the university to keep pace with advancement.

The changes that were implemented also corroborated with the views expressed by Robertson (2000, pp. 79-80) who argued that changes in higher education in the twenty-first century would result in the student being the:

principal architect of the institution's character. Student choices and student behaviour overall will drive institutional responses in all but the most prestigious and well funded research institutions.

Based on the above evidence, there is a direct relationship between an entrepreneurial unit and the formulation of new policy in response to the needs created by the establishment of such a unit.

4. Did leadership play a role in driving entrepreneurialism in each unit?

The information derived from Documents 11, 12 and 13 showed that there was no specific leader of the Summer Programme. Information was sent to the administration by a Director and Coordinators in the Faculty in no particular order. It seemed, therefore, that each department was responsible for managing the courses, staff and other related activities associated with the programme. As outlined in the reviewed literature, Kotter (1990, pp.5-6) in distinguishing between management and leadership quickly pointed out that management and leadership together can make an effective organization. As indicated earlier by Mr. VS, the underlying reason for the programme was the fact that the Faculty of Social Sciences was enjoying the benefits of surpluses from their programme and he as the then Dean thought it wise to have a similar programme in his Faculty especially at a time when financial resources were strained. Nobody in particular took ownership of the programme although there was a management committee similar to all the other traditional committees that were appointed each year to help in the management of different aspects of the university's and faculty's operations. Clearly, defined leadership seemed to be missing in this Faculty's Summer Programme.

Based on the information provided in the interview with Mr. VS it is clear that the programme did not have a home office (like Social Sciences) but was run out of the Dean's office with some help from the only Administrative Assistant in the Faculty. When the responsibility for the programme was shifted to the Office of the Deputy Dean (Distance Education and Outreach), again it was managed by that Deputy Dean together with all the other responsibilities assigned to that

office. Obviously then the programme, although new, was managed like any other unit within the faculty, but not necessarily led. This type of operation is supported in the literature on the management of traditional higher education organizations. It clearly lends credence to the argument presented by Davies et al (2001, pp. 1027-1028) that “the running of faculties and schools has been based on management as opposed to leadership”.

In summary, therefore, leadership did not play a part in driving entrepreneurialism in the Faculty’s Summer Programme, but it did not feel the effects of the lack of leadership because it was not the forerunner of summer programmes. Mr. VS summed it up this way: “I am sure that coming after Social Sciences did help in resolving some of the problems”.

Based on the findings and the discussion outlined above, one can conclude that the Faculty of Humanities and Education Summer Programme was intended to be an entrepreneurial unit from the onset and that barriers and obstacles were encountered during the early years of that programme. However, because that programme started after the Faculty of Social Sciences Summer Programme, that unit was not only spared some of the challenges, barriers and obstacles experienced by the Social Sciences Unit, but benefited as a result of the strides that were made as a result of the latter programme.

CHAPTER 6

FACULTY OF SCIENCE AND AGRICULTURE SUMMER PROGRAMME

In order to determine whether the birth and continued existence of the Faculty of Science and Agriculture Summer Programme could be used to advance my theory that entrepreneurialism could be driven by minor enclaves, it was therefore necessary to carry out a similar investigation as was done in the case of the Faculty of Social Sciences Summer Programme and the Faculty of Humanities and Education Summer Programme. Documentary and interview data were used. The findings and discussion follow.

Findings

Research Question 1

Relevant information with respect to Research Question 1 “Why and how was each unit created and was each one entrepreneurial in nature from its very beginning?” was found in fifteen documents and in responses to interview questions by the Senior Administrative Assistant in the Faculty. The Summer Programme began in the Faculty of Natural Sciences in 1993. Evidence of this was found in two memoranda from the then Dean of the Faculty to the Campus Registrar (Documents 1 & 2.) The first one dated April 5, 1993 to the Campus Registrar advised him that at the last meeting of Academic Board the Deputy Principal had asked him to prepare a budget for summer courses to be mounted by the Faculty for presentation to the St. Augustine Planning and Estimates Committee and the Finance and General Purposes Committee. The budget for two Physics courses was attached. The second memorandum dated April 21, 1993 provided an additional budget for two plant science courses. Additional information with respect to the start of the programme was found in minutes of Academic Board meeting of June 3, 1993 at which approval was granted for the mounting of special summer courses in four Mathematics and Computer Sciences courses subject to the re-examination of the fees and budget for the courses named (Document 3).

In response to interview question 1 “Why did the Programme start?” the Senior Administrative Assistant advised that the programme started primarily to offer failing students an opportunity to recover and was not driven by any economic persuasion. She further advised that the programme was not offered to students who were pursuing the course for the first time but for students who were repeating a course. She continued “compared with Social Sciences, in direct contrast you could not just walk off the street and say you coming to do it for the very first time”. The Senior Administrative Assistant admitted that the programme was financially viable and that surpluses from the programme were used to help fund certain initiatives in the Faculty although the programme was “no way as successful economically as Social Sciences”.

One year later the Bursary was asked to set up special accounts for the three departments within the Faculty that were involved in offering Summer courses. A memorandum dated April 28, 1994 from the Deputy Dean (Distance Education) to the Senior Accountant (Budgetary Control) informed him that the Faculty of Natural Sciences would be offering a Summer Programme in 1994 (Document 4). He asked for special accounts to be opened to accommodate the payment of fees for the Departments of Plant Science, Physics and Mathematics & Computer Sciences. A total of nine courses were offered that year, two first year plant science courses, two first year physics courses, three computer sciences courses – two first year courses and one second year course, and two first year Mathematics courses. Confirmation that the special accounts were opened (Document 6) came in the form of a memorandum dated October 2, 1994 from the Senior Accountant (Budgetary Control) to the Deputy Dean (Distance Education). Notices advertising the 1994 Summer Programme were posted (Document 5). The notices contained among other things, the names of the courses that were being offered, the names of contact persons for each course (secretarial staff in the respective departments), the limit of the number of courses per applicant (two), the cost per course and the date on which applications would be closed. The notice also advised that application forms were available from the respective departments in the Faculty of Natural Sciences.

In response to interview question 3 “What were the obstacles preceding the birth and in the early years of the programme. How did you overcome them and did new ones arise?” the Senior Administrative Assistant advised that one of the directives from the Faculty to Departments was that all costs associated with the running of the programme must be covered. If it was envisaged that break even could not be realized, the course was not offered. However, in response to interview question 7 “What have been the main successes of the programme?” she reiterated that surpluses were realized at the very beginning and the fact that the money came in very useful for the Faculty. “We’ve done some major renovations. We’ve paid for conferences for some members of staff..... we fund our annual prizes function out of the summer funds and a number of other initiatives that come along. It has been successful financiallyno way in the area of Social Sciences but it has been financially successful”.

There is evidence that the Faculty of Agriculture had been running a Long Vacation Teaching Programme from as far back as 1988 (Document 19). All the participants were registered Agriculture students who had sat and failed a course or were pre-empting courses. The programme gained the support of Academic Board who agreed at its meeting on April 28, 1988 to recommend to the University Academic Committee approval of the proposed Faculty of Agriculture long vacation programme on an experimental basis (Document 20). The Bursary was asked to service the programme (Document 21) and an Income and Expenditure statement which was attached to a memorandum dated December, 1988 from the Senior Accountant (Revenue and Cash Management) to the coordinator of the programme showed a surplus of eighteen hundred dollars after expenses had been paid (Document 22).

The Faculty of Natural Sciences and the Faculty of Agriculture were joined in 1996 to form the Faculty of Agriculture and Natural Sciences and the Dean in a memorandum dated May 19, 1997 to the Campus Bursar advised that a summer programme would be mounted by the combined Faculty. He asked for an account to be opened for the School of Natural Sciences students and a separate account for the School of Agriculture students (Document 12). Evidence that the joint programme was financially successful was found in Document 17 in the form of a

memorandum dated October 28, 1998 from the Senior Accountant (Budgets) to the Dean of the Faculty advising that there was a balance (profit) of twenty-eight thousand, one hundred and ninety-eight dollars and fifty cents at the end of the 1997 programme. The Bursary advised that the balance would be carried forward to 1998.

Research Question 2

Information with respect to research question 2 “What barriers/obstacles were encountered in the creation of each entrepreneurial unit within the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine Campus?” was gained from ten Documents and from responses to interview questions by the Senior Administrative Assistant.

During the early years of the Faculty of Agriculture long vacation programme there was evidence of challenges and obstacles. Academic Board at its meeting on November 2, 1989 retroactively approved the offering of Agriculture courses during the summer of that year to those students who needed the courses either to proceed in the degree programme or to graduate. The Board sought and received the assurance that university lecturers had taught the courses and therefore approved of the Faculty continuing its programme, subject to the courses being taught by university appointed lecturers (Document 24). A statement of Income and Expenditure from the Bursary for the 1989 programme showed that a surplus of four thousand, three hundred and ten dollars was realized (Document 23). The total surplus for 1988 and 1989 then stood at six thousand, one hundred and ten dollars. The Bursary expressed concern about the level of fees that the students were charged and advised that an average fee of five hundred and twenty-five would have been more equitable and would have yielded a surplus of nine hundred and eighty dollars instead of the four thousand plus dollars. There is evidence that the students felt that the fees for the courses were too high (Document 25). This resulted in insufficient numbers to mount the programme in 1992 and as such the programme was cancelled that year. By 1993, the idea of a summer programme, local or international was seen as not in the best interest of young members of staff. Evidence of this is recorded in the minutes of the Board, Faculty of Agriculture at its meeting on March 8, 1993 at which the idea of an International Summer Programme was discussed (Document 26). The Board

noted one staff member's view that the whole issue of a Summer Programme was a disincentive to young staff as the University of the West Indies placed emphasis on research and publications as against teaching activities. He also noted that many departments were at that time greatly understaffed and thought that it would be difficult for them to participate in a Summer Programme.

In 1994 and 1995 there were still problems with respect to information being passed on to the Registry in a timely fashion (Document 27) and the scheduling of examinations (Documents 28 & 29). The Assistant Registrar in a memorandum dated June 10, 1994 to the Dean of the Faculty asked to be provided with a list of courses which the Faculty intended to offer in the summer. She also asked the Dean to state whether non –UWI registered students would be allowed to follow and sit examinations in the stated courses. As far as the scheduling of examinations were concerned the Acting Dean in a memorandum dated July 19, 1995 to the Assistant Registrar (Examinations) asked her to place back to its original date (prior to the ill advised revision prompted by the coordinator of the programme in the Faculty) an examination for a particular course to allow the Faculty enough time to complete lectures as scheduled. The Assistant Registrar (Examinations) in a memorandum dated July 28, 1995 to the coordinator of the Summer Programme advised him of the new examination date and time for two courses. However, she indicated that she had acceded to the request, notwithstanding the regulation that “in no case any such change be made later than one week prior to the commencement of the series of examinations”.

In the early years of the programme in the Faculty of Natural Sciences there are examples of “slip ups” on the part of the Faculty in the administration of the programme. In a memorandum dated July 21, 1995 from the Acting Dean of the Faculty to the Assistant Registrar (Examinations) in response to a memorandum from her, he advised that he had held discussions with a representative of the Department of Mathematics and Computer Sciences. He acknowledged that the Department “was remiss in not sending the list through the Faculty Office” and confirmed that the candidates (some of whom were from the Faculty of Arts (now Humanities and Education) or Social Sciences) were eligible to write the examinations. The Acting Dean also conceded that “it is quite clear that the way

these summer courses are administered is far from satisfactory and that we need to put proper procedures in place to avoid confusion and error” (Document 8). In 1998 the Faculty was admonished by the Assistant Registrar Student Affairs (Admissions) who wrote to the Dean asking to be informed of all courses that were being offered in the summer of that year. She also requested the names of the students who were accepted to read those courses and reminded the Faculty that the Admissions Section “must have ALL information concerning students registered on the Campus” (Document 15). An apology for the delay in forwarding the information was sent by the Dean to the Assistant Registrar Student Affairs (Admissions). Included with the memorandum was the relevant information with respect to the Faculty’s 1998 Summer Programme (Document 16).

In response to interview questions, the Senior Administrative Assistant outlined the many obstacles encountered during the early years of the programme in the Faculty of Natural Sciences and the early years of the programme after the Faculties of Agriculture and the Faculty of Natural Sciences were combined to form the Faculty of Agriculture and Natural Sciences (later renamed Faculty of Science and Agriculture). In response to interview questions 1 and 2 “Why did the programme start?” and “How did the programme start?” she advised that from the very beginning “we had two dilemmas, we had Summer Programme but we also remained the only Faculty that still today carries a supplemental so the Dean is trying to impress upon people that having supplementals is really counterproductive to running a summer programme....he has had some resistance but change comes hard”.

During the course of the interview she outlined several obstacles and barriers that were encountered during the early years of the programme. The first challenge she identified was the human resource factor. She argued that unlike Social Sciences it was not easy to get science people to come in to teach relevant courses. She advised that under the semester system “lecturers were already quarrelling about how much they were doing so they weren’t interested in really coming back to do a summer full time commitment and you couldn’t get a good core of people outside, as Social Sciences get for their programme”. In response to interview

question 3 “What were the obstacles preceeding the birth and in the early years of the programme. How did you overcome them and did new ones arise?” she pointed out that those lecturers who participated in the programme adopted a “mercenary approach to how they were asking for payment in a structured way ... in a way they never asked for it in the normal semester. So they documented preparation for a lecture, they documented marking of scripts, they documented everything they did”. This resulted in high human resource costs. However, in response to interview question 9 “Are there any other thoughts about the programme that you would like to share with me?” she conceded that the appraisal system at the University of the West Indies contributed to the human resource problems. She argued that “one of the issues that makes it difficult is that you are using the same staff and people are exhausted and because of the way you rate people, you need to do your research, you need to have your publications and you need to do your teaching so where do you put that kind of activity”.

The second challenge she identified was the tremendous overhead costs. She again compared her Faculty with the Faculty of Social Sciences. She argued that in the Social Sciences situation a student with the basic qualifications could walk off the street and enroll in a course since a Social Sciences course could be easily modularized and packaged, but that it was much more difficult with the science courses. In addition to the lecture for the course, labs had to be set up and therefore not only did lab space become an issue but also the payment to lab demonstrators also reared its head. Lab demonstrators saw the programme as extra duties and realizing that the programme was making money demanded their share.

The Senior Administrative Assistant identified the third challenge as the way in which the programme was treated initially by the university administration. The programme found itself in what she called “no man’s land” as far as the administration was concerned. “Nobody wanted to deal with it because they kept saying that this was unofficial, it was an extra job ... in admin they did not even file summer programme forms ... they just left them in a box, it was not put in the student’s files”. There was also some contention as to who should provide the final sign-off on the student registration form after the Bursary official had signed off with respect to the financial aspect of the registration. In the normal semester,

the Registry did the final sign off but for the summer registration the Dean was forced to do the final sign-off.

The fourth challenge she identified was student related problems. With the implementation of the semester system the university calendar was very tight. The period between the end of semester two and the beginning of the Summer Programme did not necessarily give the students enough time to plan. In light of this some of them ended up taking too many courses thereby exceeding the amount of credits allowed. Since there was no systematic monitoring of students from the administration end, the Senior Administrative Assistant acknowledged that she developed a manual record system. When a student wanted to pursue a Social Sciences course for which he/she wanted the credits to be counted towards his/her degree, the student had to first get a sign-off from her. In that way she was able to keep track of students in her Faculty who were pursuing summer courses, not only in her Faculty, but in the Faculty of Social Sciences as well. In the early days as well, before the university provided clear regulations where the summer programme was concerned, including the carrying forward of course work marks from semesters one and two, a tremendous amount of paper work had to be dealt with. She commented that “unlike now, where they say it is automatic for a year everybody wrote so you had a ton of paper”.

The fifth and final challenge she identified was the loophole that was created with respect to the regulations governing the time frame for the completion of a bachelor's degree. Because of the summer programme students were able to fast-track their degrees. Students were literally finishing their degrees in two and a half years which was contrary to the regulations. Initially, the regulations were enforced by the Faculty but it was soon discontinued “since there was another regulation which said that a student will graduate when he/she satisfies the requirement for which he/she is declared so what are you going to do if he/she finished early?”

Research Question 3

Relevant information with respect to Research Question 3 “What is the relationship between the entrepreneurial units within the University of the West

Indies, St. Augustine and policy formulation?” were found in the responses to the interview questions and in four Documents. In response to interview question 3 “What were the obstacles preceding the birth and in the early years of the programme. How did you overcome them and did new ones arise?” the Senior Administrative Assistant described how the Faculty went about changing the rules in order to deal with the summer programme phenomenon. She identified the number of credits that students were allowed to accumulate during the summer and the refund of fees as an example of some of the issues that had to be dealt with by the Faculty. She recalled that in the early days there were no regulations concerning refunds for students who dropped out of a summer course. There were no guidelines as to when a student could be refunded, how they could be refunded and the portion that should be refunded. She conceded that “a lot of time the Faculties made their rules as they went along because the administration did not take an active role, they didn’t really want to take on more work.... so a lot of the administration of the summer programme was really vested in the Faculty”. The Senior Administrative Assistant explained that the Social Sciences Summer Programme had a great impact on her Faculty’s programme since a tremendous number of Natural Sciences students did Social Sciences summer courses. She explained that while they wrote some new regulations, since Social Sciences started before her Faculty, they looked at what Social Sciences had and went with what was applicable to them. The revised regulations were eventually approved by Academic Board at its meeting on March 27, 1997 (Document 11). The Board agreed to support in principle recommendations from the Board, Faculty of Agriculture and Natural Sciences in relation to the mounting of a viable summer programme which required amendments to the Faculty’s Regulations.

In response to interview question 7 “What have been the main successes of the programme?” the Senior Administrative Assistant related that the programme had caused an improvement in the throughput rate. She acknowledged that the Faculty “had a strong array of prerequisites and corequisites.....when we did summer we began to see that we really needed to review what we had and to see whether co-requisites and all these things were necessary”. She continued “it forced you to look at your rules to see if what you had before was really necessaryit really improved the throughput rate”.

As far as the policy for the mounting of courses was concerned, the Senior Administrative Assistant explained that the Dean had always asked each Department to provide a total proposal for each course. Because of quality issues, they had to indicate as well that they had available resources i.e. somebody to teach the course and the availability of demonstrators (where applicable). An approved university examiner for each course also had to be on board since for some reason some students had the concept that the summer semester was easier than Semesters 1 & 2.

The impact of the summer programme was such that in June 1995 the University Academic Committee and the University Finance and General Purposes Committee which governed the whole University and not just the St. Augustine Campus approved guidelines for Fees and Incomes for Summer Courses/Programmes (Document 9). Eight guidelines were listed. Guideline 1 read in part:

Courses and programmes should generate financial surpluses i.e. an excess of revenues over costs. The underlying principles for pricing the courses and programmes should be (i) cost recovery and (ii) revenue generation.

General regulations were approved by the University in May, 1997. The Board for Undergraduate Studies (BUS) approved “Regulations Governing the Summer Schools” after taking into account the comments and adjustments suggested by Academic Boards (on the three campuses). In correspondence to Campus Registrars dated June 10, 1997 the secretary of BUS advised that the “regulations which become effective immediately” were attached for information and circulation (Document 13). By May 1999 BUS agreed to the conduct of a review of summer school programmes on each campus, the aim of which was to determine whether there was equivalency in the quality of the provision between that of the Summer School courses and the same courses taught in either semester 1 or semester 2 (Document 18). With respect to the Faculty of Agriculture and Natural Sciences the Senior Administrative Assistant indicated that a total review would be done early next year (2008) of the summer programme with respect to

“how it should go forward and the impact of stopping supplementals... when we merged what presented itself was a lot of contradictory rules....Science only gave supplementals for first year students but Agriculture gave supplementals for first, second and third year and that had a lot of issues because we were one faculty but we had different rules for different parts of the Faculty”.

Research Question 4

The answer to research question 4 “Did leadership play a role in driving entrepreneurialism in each unit?” as far as the Faculty of Agriculture and Natural Sciences were concerned is implicit in the responses to the interview questions by the Senior Administrative Assistant. She advised that unlike Social Sciences she managed the summer programme in her Faculty. “The AA did it. The AA was primarily responsible for seeing about the summer programme”. In response to interview question 9 “Are there any other thoughts about the programme that you would like to share with me?” the Senior Administrative Assistant advised that “really we should have somebody who will manage the summer programme; it has always been a part of everything else that the AA was doing”. She concluded that “there is a lot we can do, a lot, so there is scope but it takes somebody to direct people to lead to it and somebody to be responsible for it which will really be useful.....but there is scope, we probably will not be able to do it the way Social Sciences do theirs but there are things that you do that we have the infrastructure for but you have to have somebody and dedicate resources to develop it”.

Discussion

The extent to which the findings in this case have answered the research questions in relation to the literature will now be discussed.

1. Why and how was each unit created and was each one entrepreneurial in nature from its very beginning?

In this particular case there were two programmes which were eventually combined when the Faculties were joined. In the case of the long vacation programme in the Faculty of Agriculture, the documentary evidence clearly

indicated that the reason for the programme was to facilitate students who had sat and failed courses or were interested in pre-empting courses. Fees were charged and from all indications (a surplus of eighteen hundred dollars in the first year of operations) the programme was able to stand alone financially. As far as the Faculty of Natural Sciences was concerned the documentary evidence and the responses from the Senior Administrative Assistant indicate that that programme was not driven by any economic persuasion but purely as a means of recovery for students who had failed Level 1 courses during Semesters 1 and 2. However, the evidence showed as well that the programme realized a profit which the Senior Administrative Assistant indicated was used to fund Faculty initiatives.

After the Faculties were joined in 1996, documentary evidence again showed that the first joint summer programme in 1997 realized a profit. Therefore, both the individual programmes and the joint programme were successful financially from inception. They were not only able to direct and sustain themselves but to provide funding for areas in which the Faculty could not afford based on its only source of traditional income from the Government. This finding is definitely in keeping with the characteristics of entrepreneurialism as described by Clark (1998) and supported by Shattock (2003) who argued that entrepreneurialism can be a means of achieving self-directed autonomy. Financial independence and the ability to help others are surely criteria for attaining such status.

2. What barriers/obstacles were encountered in the creation of each entrepreneurial unit within the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine?

Shattock (2003, p. 154) in identifying the intrinsic inhibitions that he considered to be the stumbling blocks on the university's road to entrepreneurialism named organizational culture and tradition as one of the areas. One of the early challenges identified in the long vacation programme in the then Faculty of Agriculture was the suggestion from the Bursary that students should have been charged less for courses which would have resulted in a minimal surplus. The idea of realizing profits within a university setting was not part of the culture of the organization.

The challenge of the disinterest of staff members and the mercenary approach of those who were involved proved to be a very difficult problem because the appraisal system was certainly not in line with the new phenomenon of the summer programme. In a more business like setting with an identifiable leader efforts could have been made to reform the appraisal system to place a heavier weight on teaching which would have inevitably incorporated the extra teaching that was required during the summer programme. This slow to change situation is in line with Davies' (1987, p. 15) argument that the coming together of the providing tradition and the client/consumer tradition was usually a conflict situation "certainly in the initial stages as, for example, the flexibility required by businesslike operations is contradicted by the rigidities of state or institutional procedures and policies". The simultaneous operation of the free supplemental examination system and the fee paying summer programme in the faculty is certainly not good business sense but because the Faculty has a tradition of offering supplementals, although that practice was stopped by both the Faculty of Social Sciences and the Faculty of Humanities and Education with the introduction of the semester system, is another tradition that they must now free themselves from. At least the present Dean has realized that continuing the supplemental is counterproductive to running a summer programme, but as the Senior Administrative Assistant pointed out "he has had some resistance but change comes hard".

The loophole that was created with respect to the regulations governing the time frame for the completion of a bachelor's degree was fully exploited by the students. They were initially debarred from formally completing their degree but the Senior Administrative Assistant acknowledged that they were allowed to graduate because of the existence of another rule. The concept of universities becoming more businesslike in their approach carries with it the concept of the student as a consumer rather than merely a learner. Webster (2003) drew attention to the fact that higher education institutions, in response to the demand of their various stakeholders have embraced the market discourse. He pointed out that higher education literature was now replete with "language, symbolism and metaphors of popular business management". Words like "best practice" "list of

indicators (benchmarks)", "effective investment" and "long term returns" now form part of the vocabulary of managers and administrators of higher education institutions. One can therefore understand why students can identify with the concept of their being consumers and in taking advantage of the opportunity that presented itself with the establishment of the summer programme can therefore be deemed as students exercising their consumer rights.

In conclusion, therefore, despite the many challenges and obstacles that were encountered the Faculty of Agriculture and Natural Sciences Summer Programme has prevailed. In keeping with the directives of the university administration, it continues to be not only financially viable but is in fact the entrepreneurial arm of that Faculty.

3. What is the relationship between the entrepreneurial units within the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine and policy formulation?

Evidence in the findings point to the fact that not only were rules and regulations formed and implemented by the university administration because of the Summer Programmes but the fact that the Faculty of Agriculture and Natural Sciences was forced to review its own Faculty rules and regulations should be carefully noted. To its credit, though, it adopted new regulations that the Faculty of Social Sciences had implemented and then sought to come up with other suitable regulations specific to their situation. The evidence showed that the Faculty was forced to operate in a fashion that was more in keeping with business procedures than with procedures associated with the management of higher education institutions. The Senior Administrative Assistant admitted that there was a strong array of prerequisites and corequisites and the Faculty was forced to determine whether in fact they were necessary. The approval and implementation of amended regulations in 1997 by the Faculty not only ensured a more viable summer programme but also resulted in an improved throughput rate for the Faculty.

Two other pieces of evidence in the findings also suggest that there is a direct relationship between entrepreneurial units and policy formulation. The Dean

instituted a policy that in order for courses to be included in the summer offerings a total package had to be first presented for consideration and approval. The Senior Administrative Assistant alluded to the fact that that policy became important because of the issue of quality. The Faculty had to be certain that the summer version was comparable with what was offered in the semesters. This position is in keeping with the position taken by Neal (1998 p. 77) who argued that:

...any entrepreneurial university must find coherent and persuasive ways of measuring, documenting, and ensuring the quality of its programs in order to build credibility and show accountability to its key constituencies, both within the academy and among external groups.

The quality issue had to be dealt with head on and the Faculty through the Dean had to rise to the challenge. He, therefore, insisted on a 'business plan' for each course inclusive of specific requirements to ensure similarity of quality of the summer programme version and the semester version. The evidence also suggests that more policy changes are envisaged because of the Faculty's plan to conduct a total review in 2008 in an effort to determine how it should go forward.

4. Did leadership play a role in driving entrepreneurialism in each unit?

Based on the responses of the Senior Administrative Assistant it is evident that the Faculty of Agriculture and Natural Sciences Summer Programme was not led by a specific person. In addition to her duties in the Faculty, she was also given the task of managing the programme. Her responses were corroborated by the indirect information gained from data presented in Document 5. The notification of the 1994 summer programme not only outlined the courses to be offered but provided the names of contact persons for each course. These persons were in fact secretarial staff in the respective departments. The programme was therefore managed but not necessarily led. Leadership then did not play a major part in driving entrepreneurialism in the Faculty's summer programme, but based on the views expressed by the Senior Administrative Assistant, the programme if properly led could become even more successful since "there is scope".

As mentioned in the case of the Faculty of Humanities and Education summer programme, the manner in which the operations of the Faculty of Agriculture and Natural Sciences summer programme was managed is supported in the literature on the management of traditional higher education organizations. Their operation also gives credence to the argument presented by Davies et al (2001, pp. 1027-1028) that “the running of faculties and schools has been based on management as opposed to leadership”.

The findings and discussion of this particular case study indicate that the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine had gradually changed from the culture of “make no profit” to a culture of using the profits generated as an additional source of income which helped in providing infrastructure and in the running of the Faculty. Evidence of entrepreneurial action, structure and attitude were seen in the following ways: the Unit came up with creative ways to register and monitor the students in the programme (fast, businesslike approach), and they used the new regulations developed as a result of the Faculty of Social Sciences Summer Programme and sought approval for additional ones as needed by that Faculty. In other words, the wheel was not reinvented. The emerging entrepreneurial attitude came out in the responses by the Senior Administrative Assistant who informed, among other things, that there was scope for more entrepreneurial activity within the unit, because of the many opportunities that were possible in the areas of Agriculture and Science education. A definite leader was however, lacking. In this particular case, management more than definite leadership moved the programme along.

CHAPTER 7

CONTINUING ENGINEERING EDUCATION CENTRE

While the Faculty of Social Sciences was the pioneer as far as “Summer Programmes” were concerned, the Faculty of Engineering must be credited as being the pioneering Faculty with respect to the provision of continuing professional education at the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine Campus. Although the programme itself started way back in 1973, it was not until 1988 (three years after the visit to the United States by the twelve European senior university administrators) that a decision was taken to establish a full time centre to conduct continuing engineering education on an income generating basis, as a response to the unfavourable economic situation that prevailed in the country, and by extension the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine at that time. While the Chairman and members of the Committee that led and managed its operations saw the Centre as a means of providing an additional source of income, the findings will show that the University administration and the culture of the institution was not in line with the business-like operations that was required for such as operation. The findings will also show that this enclave not only drove entrepreneurialism at the Faculty of Engineering but its operations encouraged the formation of other centres within the Faculty which led to the formation of the Engineering Institute (a combination of all the entrepreneurial centres within the Faculty). The findings and the discussion of the Continuing Engineering Education Centre case study will now be presented.

Findings

Research Question 1

Relevant information with respect to research question 1 “Why and how was each unit created and was each one entrepreneurial in nature from its very beginning?” was found in twelve Documents and in responses to the interview questions. The unit was established in 1973 (Document 1). In a memorandum dated February 7, 1973 to the Accountant (Budgets) in the Bursary, the Chairman of the Continuing Education Committee, Dr. MC advised of the establishment of the Committee and requested an account number into which income from the fees for the courses to be mounted should be put into and to which expenses should be charged. The

Accountant (Budgets) was also advised that the authorization for the use of the funds would come from the Chairman of the Committee. A copy of the terms of reference of the Committee was attached to the memorandum. Approval was granted to the Committee from the Board, Faculty of Engineering to mount seven courses during the academic year 1973/1974 (Document 2). The number of courses mounted each year was quite small and the Faculty was adamant that each course should be economically viable. This conclusion was drawn based on (Document 8) which provided evidence that in 1980 the Board, Faculty of Engineering approved the mounting of three courses “subject to the operation of a realistic registration deadline by the Course Director to ensure that the courses would not be mounted if it seemed likely that they would not be economically feasible”. By 1981 there were uncertainties regarding the running of short courses by the Committee. This fact was alluded to by Mr. CI, a Lecturer in the Faculty of Engineering who wrote to his Head of Department on December 29th 1981 (Document 18) seeking advice, support and assistance to mount a proposed seminar on Metal Working during the period February 15-19, 1982 in light of the uncertainties regarding short courses in the Faculty. Following a request from the Head of the Department of Mechanical Engineering (Document 19) to the Chairman of the Campus Committee on Continuing Education for advice based on Mr. CI’s queries approval was given to hold the seminar subject to certain conditions (Document 20). These conditions included the approval of the Faculty of Engineering sub-committee for Continuing Education, the incurrence of no financial loss and no pay of any kind to lecturers involved in the running of the seminar. In May 1982 Mr. CI, the course director reported on the success of the seminar based on the quality of the course content, the quality of the lecturers/presenters, the number of participants (56) and the healthy surplus realized (Document 23).

In October, 1982 when new committees were named for the 1982/1983 academic year, Dr. MC was retained as Chairman of the Continuing Education Committee and Mr. CI was selected to be a part of the six member committee (Document 24). However, by October 1986 Mr. CI was appointed Chairman of the Committee (Document 29). In March 1988 the Board, Faculty of Engineering agreed in principle to the proposal from the Continuing Engineering Education Committee

for the establishment of a full time Continuing Education Centre to replace the Committee in the Faculty (Document 33). The Committee was of the view that in light of the then economic and financial situation facing both the nation and the University, it was imperative for the Faculty of Engineering to consider the establishment of a full time unit to conduct such continuing education activities on an income generating basis. By 1994 operations of the Continuing Engineering Education Centre had expanded to overseas operations albeit regionally since courses and workshops were conducted in St. Lucia, St. Vincent and Tortola (Document 39). The expansion of the operations of the Centre necessitated the appointment of a training coordinator. She was appointed with effect from March 4, 1996 for a period of six months in the first instance. The Chairman advised the Assistant Registrar (Personnel) that “her emoluments shall be paid by the Continuing Engineering Education Centre” (Document 40).

Responses to the interview questions by Prof. CI, (formerly Mr. CI), corroborated the information gained from the Documents with respect to the birth and early years of the Committee which eventually became a Centre. In response to interview questions 1 and 2 “Why did the programme start?” and “How did the programme start?” Mr. CI responded that in the 1970s Dr. MC, who was on a UNESCO committee on continuing engineering education started to mount continuing engineering education courses. He explained that “these things were starting to become popular in universities where people realized they had to do some sort of updating, professional development courses and so on”. Prof. CI further explained that only a few courses were offered each year and Dr. MC would sometimes ask staff members to get involved. “So I got involved and became a member of the committee. It was called the Continuing Education Committee of the Faculty of Engineering and in 1986 I took over as chairman of the committee”. Prof. CI advised that the committee became very profitable and he had to run a professional organization. The first permanent member of staff specifically for the committee was hired and within a short space of time the staff complement grew to four.

In response to interview question 7 “What have been the main successes of the Centre?” Prof. CI boasts that he was very innovative. “We went from five courses

for the first fifteen years of our existence and then we just shot up in about five, six years to fifty courses. That was a remarkable achievement in Trinidad and Tobago in continuing education by anybody, private or public. It had never been done before. We sought of led the way. That was that success, that we got a name, the Faculty got a name for doing this thing. We made money”. Prof. CI also indicated that with the impending formation of the Engineering Institute in which the idea of Centres was formed, it was agreed that the Continuing Education Committee would be subsumed by the Continuing Engineering Education Centre. The Centre initially was the main financier of the Institute and Prof. CI also indicated that surplus funds were also used to finance projects in the Faculty of Engineering. For example, the centre bought equipment for the Faculty and also assisted staff members with extra money to go on conferences.

Information with respect to the entrepreneurial nature of the Committee was also gained in Prof. CI’s response to interview question 7. He argued that being an entrepreneurial unit provided other benefits to the University. The constant contact with persons from the engineering industry actually helped the Faculty with its accreditation issues. Course attendees provided necessary feedback on the quality of the graduates and the areas in which they thought more teaching could have been done. More information was gathered in that format than in the formal meetings with industry personnel once per semester. Finally, in response to interview question 9 “Are there any other thoughts about the unit you would like to share with me?” Prof. CI alluded to the pioneering role of the Committee/Centre. He concluded “we were really leaders and the pioneers in this thing particularly in a big way in continuing education, continuing engineering education particularly”.

Research Question 2

Information with respect to research question 2 “What barriers/obstacles were encountered in the creation of each entrepreneurial unit with the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine Campus?” was found in responses to the interview questions and in sixteen Documents. The first challenge that was encountered was the repeated requests by the University administration for information concerning the operations of the Committee. In 1978, five years after the establishment of the

Committee, the Campus Planning and Estimates Committee requested a report with respect to continuing education in the Faculty of Engineering (Document 4). The Assistant Dean, Continuing Education, Research and Postgraduate Affairs in a memorandum dated June 8, 1978 to the Chairman of the Committee requested a report and advised him that the Planning and Estimates Committee mandated that the report should include:

1. The composition of the sub-committee
2. The frequency of meetings
3. The programme for the 1977/1978 session
4. The rate of payment to lecturers
5. A statement of accounts for the Continuing Education funds
6. The rate of fees charged
7. The procedure and purpose for which funds were disbursed

The Chairman obliged (Document 6) and provided a detailed status report under the following headings:

1. Background information which included the terms of reference of the committee
2. Courses held since the inception and number of persons who attended
3. Composition of the Committee
4. Programme for 1977/78 session
5. Statement of Accounts
6. Disbursement of Funds

Another request for a report on the operations of the Committee came to the Dean of the Faculty from the Campus Bursar in the form of a memorandum dated February 11, 1981 (Document 9). The Bursar advised the Dean that it had been brought to his attention that the Faculty was running short courses in continuing education and on investigation it was revealed that fees for the courses were not deposited into the Bursary. He further advised that that was in direct

contravention of Clauses 47 and 48 of the University's Financial Code. He therefore asked the Dean to apprise him of the following:

1. Who is responsible in your Faculty for collecting funds for short courses?
2. Who authorizes expenditure on these accounts?
3. Is there a bank account in the Faculty?
4. What contributions are being made to the Faculty Consultancy Fund in respect to fees received, if any?

It should be noted that these questions were specific to the Unit, since it was the only one of its kind at that time.

The Dean responded to the Bursar by means of a memorandum dated February 23, 1981 (Document 10). He expressed surprise at the statements and questions in the Bursary's letter to him. He informed the Bursary as follows:

“The Faculty had been running short courses for several years under the aegis of its Continuing Education Committee, the chairman of which is Dr. MC. Not only have all monies been paid into the Bursary but also there has been a Special Account for years. The account has the number 70-504 and is under the control of your office. Expenditure from the Account can only be authorized on the signature of the Chairman of the Continuing Education Committee and the Assistant Dean (Continuing Education, Research and Postgraduate Matters). Moreover, such expenditure must be approved by the Committee”.

The Bursar was also informed by the Dean that the Faculty had no bank account and again expressed surprise that that question was posed. He further advised the Bursar that there was no relationship whatever between the Faculty Consultancy Fund and the Continuing Education Fund.

The second challenge encountered was the decision of Academic Board that a Campus Central Committee would be established to oversee the management of

short courses on the campus. The Faculty's response to that decision is recorded in the minutes of the meeting of the Board, Faculty of Engineering held on February 12, 1981 (Document 11). The Faculty felt that such a committee would "increase bureaucracy and would be counter-productive" and that guidelines for Faculties should be laid down instead. It was also felt that compensation to University personnel for participating in short courses should not be fixed at a level where it could be regarded as a significant source of income. "Payment should therefore be limited to the level of an Honorarium with an upper limit to be fixed".

The University administration continued to probe the operations of the Committee which resulted in the identification of the third challenge that faced the committee – the ruling that lecturers could not be paid in cash for providing services for the Committee. On July 13, 1981 the Campus Secretary (now called Campus Registrar) wrote to the Assistant Dean (Continuing Education, Research and Postgraduate Affairs) advising that he had been in discussion with the Campus Bursar with respect to the use of funds generated from the Continuing Education Programme and was therefore seeking clarification about the programme (Document 12). In a memorandum dated July 16, 1981 (Document 13), the Assistant Dean (Continuing Education, Research and Postgraduate Affairs) provided the Campus Secretary with information on how the Continuing Education Committee carried out its affairs. He also expressed surprise at the request since "this is the procedure which has been in operation with the Bursary for quite sometime now". In response the Campus Secretary in a memorandum dated July 22, 1981 (Document 14) thanked the Assistant Dean for clarifying the situation for him but advised that if the \$50 payment per lecture included lecturers who were members of staff then that would be contrary to Finance and General Purposes Committee (F&GPC) decision (F.M. 88(B) (i) of March 12, 1977, which says that "academic staff members should not receive remuneration for additional duties within the University". The Campus Secretary advised that such staff members could be rewarded by financial assistance to attend conferences or to pursue research. In a memorandum dated July 27, 1981 from the Assistant Dean (Continuing Education, Research and Postgraduate Affairs) to the Campus Secretary (Document 15), he dealt with the issue of the violation of the financial

code and the sudden non-payment to members of staff concerned. He informed him that short courses scheduled for the summer of 1981 were cancelled and the Faculty was of the view that it stemmed from the issue of non payment of members of staff as proposed by the Continuing Education Committee. The Assistant Dean ended by saying that he agreed that the matter of the payment to lecturers, who were members of staff needed careful study “but I am afraid that we are likely to do more harm than good by the drastic measures we are applying all of a sudden”.

In an effort to resolve the issue, the Chairman of the newly formed Continuing Education Campus Central Committee wrote to the Campus Principal on August 17, 1981 on the subject “Continuing Education – Cessation of Payment, Faculty of Engineering” (Document 16). The Chairman asked the Principal to seek a waiver of the F&GPC ruling and in the interim to release the funds from the Faculty of Engineering Continuing Education Account so that the Faculty could meet its commitment to the members of staff involved. He reminded the Principal that the ban was introduced by the Campus Bursar through a memorandum dated June 30, 1981 on the establishment of the Campus Central Committee for Continuing Education and his appointment as Chairman by Academic Board at its meeting on May 28, 1981. However, since the other members of the Committee were not yet named it was impossible to get the required approval by the Central Committee. The Principal was also advised that the ban on payment had created embarrassment to the Faculty of Engineering and also had an adverse effect on the Continuing Education programme since a number of courses were cancelled since the ban had been instituted. The Principal responded in a letter dated August 25, 1981 (Document 17). He advised that he was unable to condone the violation of the general rules of the University or the financial rules nor was the Bursar empowered to do so. He reported that he had held discussions with the Vice Chancellor who had expressed great concern that such a situation could have developed in a section of the University. However, the Vice Chancellor recognizing that the Chairman had acted in good faith with the best interest of the Faculty and the University authorized the payments but indicated that no further payment should be made until a proper scheme duly authorized by the relevant bodies had been approved.

The fourth obstacle, the disagreement over the allocation of surplus funds, was recorded in the minutes of the meeting of the Central Campus Committee which was held on January 26, 1982 (Document 21). Among the issues discussed were proposed guidelines for running short courses, remuneration of staff teaching in continuing education courses and the allocation of surplus funds generated by continuing education courses. The members of the committee expressed strong objection to the stand taken by the St. Augustine Planning and Estimates Committee (STAPEC) with respect to the allocation of surplus funds. The committee agreed to recommend to STAPEC that surplus funds should be allocated on a 50-50 basis to the Central Committee and to the Department/Faculty generating the funds, since the Departments/Faculty were not likely to organize Continuing Education courses if none of the funds generated were to accrue to the Department/Faculty concerned.

The issue of the non-payment of university staff involved in lecturing in short courses resurfaced in May 1982 when the Campus Bursar refused to authorize payment to two staff members (Document 22). The Bursar advised the Chairman of the Central Campus Committee on Continuing Education that the recommendation “that members of staff who are required to lecture on short course will be paid provided a declaration is given by the Head of Department that the lectures are in excess of their normal teaching load” had not yet been approved by the Finance and General Purposes Committee.

Obstacle number five was the problem the Centre encountered with communicating with its clientele. In a memorandum dated February 16, 1993 (Document 36), the Assistant Dean, Services, Faculty of Engineering advised the Campus Registrar that the Continuing Engineering Education Centre was very active, since it conducted over twenty short courses annually with an average attendance of twenty participants per course/seminar. In order to facilitate faster communication with prospective course participants and sponsoring agencies he urgently requested the conversion of the internal telephone line (which necessitated the involvement of the telephone operators for external calls) to one in which external calls could be made.

The sixth challenge identified was the relationship between the Continuing Engineering Education Centre and the Bursary with respect to the receipt and disbursement of funds pertaining to the operations of the Centre. The Bursary carried out an internal audit of the Centre and submitted a report dated July 24, 1990. The Chairman in a memorandum to the Accountant (Systems and Audit) dated November 12, 1990 advised that he was in agreement with most of the recommendations which included the recommendation that course participants pay at the Bursary before the day of the course/seminar. However, he advised that it may not be possible for that to be done by all participants but felt that it would not be wise to refuse acceptance of payment at the Faculty (Document 35). On September 9, 1993 the Chairman wrote the Senior Accountant (Projects and Cash Management) requesting that a cheque be made out to the Trinidad Hilton Hotel to secure bookings for participants for an upcoming symposium. The Chairman noted that cheques from prospective participants totaling the equivalent sum had been deposited into the Bursary (Document 37).

“I used to get fierce battles with the Bursary, fierce battles”. This was Prof. CI’s first response to interview question 3 “What were the obstacles preceding the birth and in the early years of the Institute? How did you overcome them and did new ones arise?” He went on to explain that the Bursary insisted that all incoming cheques for the Centre should be made out to The University of the West Indies. However, they were not prompt in the issuing of cheques for services and expenses incurred. That situation meant that the Centre had no control over the money they made from the many short courses that were organized. Prof. CI gave the following illustration. “So, I just made a hundred thousand dollars. A hundred thousand dollars went into the Bursary over the last two weeks. I am now saying I have twenty thousand dollars for this person for food.....and they are telling me that they are only writing cheques once every two weeks....the Bursary is a very autocratic place when they ready. I had the use of the money because there were rules about what the money could be used for. It was adhered to but the timing!” As a result of the Bursary’s method of handling payments Prof. CI explained that he had the unenviable task of stalling irate service personnel like newspaper companies for advertisements for the courses and caterers who had provided

meals for course participants. In spite of the controls instituted by the Bursary, Prof. CI fumed that the Bursary “had the gall to send down an internal auditor down to me!” He explained that while all cheques eventually got to the Bursary, he actually collected some from persons who had gone to the Centre to pay for courses by cheque, but if he stuck to the rules he would have had to send them over to the Bursary to make the payment there. Recognizing that they were busy people and knowing the benefits of keeping customers happy at all times, he admitted that he simply took the cheque, gave them a temporary receipt and forwarded collected cheques to the Bursary. Mr. CI further advised that during the years when the University faced a serious financial crunch due to late payments by the Government, the relationship with the Bursary became even more difficult. “My money use to go into a hole and it can’t come back out! And let me tell you that was extremely frustrating”.

In addition to the Bursary problems Prof. CI identified complaints from participants during the later years of the programme, especially when competition from other providers of similar courses began to surface. “The major complaint that we got was about services. These were big people, managers and so on of industries....but here it was I was coming into the kind of competition that I did not have before... because people saw it as a viable thing”. He explained that participants therefore wanted the comfort and level of service that were possible in a hotel setting as opposed to what was available in classrooms in the Faculty of Engineering.

During his response to interview question 7 “what have been the main successes of the programme?” Prof. CI identified another challenge. He explained that his colleagues did not think the success of the programme would be beneficial to him personally. He shared their concerns this way. “I mean really, people used to tell me what you putting all this effort into this for, you doing your Ph.D., your Ph.D. suffering, what you doing that for you won’t get anything for it, the University won’t promote you on that but there are things that you do, you want to do and have to do”. However, he concluded that the battles with the Bursary were the most challenging of all the obstacles encountered in the running of the programme.

Research Question 3

Information relevant to research question 3 “What is the relationship between the entrepreneurial units within the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine and policy formulation?” was found in fourteen Documents and in responses to the interview questions. In 1978, the Board, Faculty of Engineering at its meeting on May 11 agreed that in order to protect members of the Continuing Education Committee approval of any application by members of that Committee for funding from the funds generated by the said Committee should be signed by the Chairman and the Assistant Dean concerned with Continuing Education (Document 5). However, at its meeting on December 8, 1978, the Board, Faculty of Engineering agreed that a procedure should be put in place for the disbursement of funds from income accrued to the Committee (Document 7). When the University set up a Campus Central Committee for Continuing Education in 1981 and a disagreement over the non payment of staff members occurred based on the Finance and General Purposes Committee Regulations that staff members should not receive remuneration for additional duties with the University, the Vice Chancellor indirectly suggested that new policy was possible (Document 17). Although he did not waive the regulations but agreed to authorize the payments to the lecturers concerned on that occasion only, he directed that no further payment should be made until a proper scheme duly authorized by the relevant bodies had been approved. These bodies included Academic Board, Finance and General Purposes Committee and the Appointments Committee. He actually promised that the matter would have been dealt with and regularized in the new academic year.

After the university restructuring exercise in 1984, there was a change in policy with respect to the management of continuing education programmes on the campus. In a memorandum dated February 20, 1985 from the Assistant Registrar (Secretariat) to the Secretary, Faculty of Engineering Continuing Engineering Education Committee in response to the secretary’s query, advised that the Campus Committee on Continuing Education was not retained and was therefore no longer in existence (Document 25).

Policy with respect to the compensation of staff members involved in continuing education courses was discussed at the meeting of the Board, Faculty of Engineering on February 6, 1986 (Document 26). At that meeting it was agreed to recommend to the St. Augustine Planning and Estimates Committee that an honoraria should be paid to all University teaching staff participating in continuing education courses, the quantum to be decided on the basis of the course budget but with an upper limit. It was also agreed to recommend that, alternatively, surplus funds from any course could be allocated for the use of university lecturers on that particular course for attending conferences, purchasing books, equipment etc. Approval for the granting of the payment of honoraria to lecturers involved in the teaching of short courses/seminars was granted by Finance and General Purposes Committee at its meeting on February 26, 1986 (Document 27). Further policy with respect to surplus funds was recommended by the Continuing Engineering Education Committee and endorsed by the Faculty of Engineering (Document 31). At its meeting on November 27, 1986, the Board, Faculty of Engineering agreed to recommend to Finance and General Purposes Committee that:

- (i) 15% of surplus funds from continuing education courses/seminars would be deposited in an appropriate general campus account for the benefit of the University whose physical resources were being used in continuing education courses.
- (ii) the remainder of surplus funds would be shared between the Continuing Education Committee general account and a special account which would have provisions for the allocation of funds for university lecturers on that particular course.

At its meeting on January 23, 1987, the Campus Finance and General Purposes Committee approved the recommendation put forward by the Board, Faculty of Engineering with respect to the apportionment of surplus funds from continuing education courses/seminars (Document 32).

As far as the enhancement of services to the Continuing Engineering Education Committee from the Bursary was concerned new policy was devised after discussions between the Chairman of the Committee and the Accountant (Project and Cash Management). In a memorandum dated November 10, 1993, from the Accountant to the Chairman, the Accountant highlighted the following:

- (i) the issue of an official receipt book to the CEEC to facilitate late payment of fees on the morning of a programme
- (ii) the need for reimbursement requests to be supported by original documents, with photocopies being kept by the CEEC
- (iii) the possibility of the CEEC donating a PC and printer to the Bursary.

A receipt book and a proforma invoice in the sum of \$US2928.00 which was the cost of the acquisition of the PC and the printer was enclosed with the memorandum (Document 38).

Evidence that the Continuing Engineering Education Centre had played a pivotal role in the development and sustenance of the Engineering Institute in particular and the Faculty in general surfaced in the Manager's report to the Board of Directors meeting which was held on June 30, 1996 and in his report to the Board, Faculty of Engineering on September 18, 1987 (Documents 41 and 42). The Manager reported that surpluses from the Centre were used in the development of the Engineering Institute's Office, the Faculty and the expansion of the Centre. In presenting a review of all the centres that comprised the Institute, he reported that the Continuing Engineering Education Centre which was on a continuous growth path had played a key role in the establishment and support of the Institute. By March 2000 the Manager of the Engineering Institute reported to the Board, Faculty of Engineering that the Institute had approved changes in the operating procedure for the Continuing Engineering Education Centre (Document 44). Policy was put in place with respect to training courses, credit policy, reduced fees for staff and full-time students, programme budgets, division of course income, honoraria and fees. The Manager also reported that a system for awarding academic credits for courses offered by the CEEC was not yet in place "but that

where appropriate, the courses could be used as Continuing Professional Development (CDP) units in the CDP programme for registered engineers.

During responses to interview questions, Professor CI confirmed that the success of the Continuing Engineering Education Committee encouraged the Faculty of Engineering to review the policy of services that could be offered by the Faculty and actually led to the establishment of the Engineering Institute. The Institute went beyond short courses, seminars, workshops and conferences. He explained that four persons TB, who joined the University in the 1980s and who was very influential in the petroleum industry, Professor MG, the then Dean of the Faculty of Engineering, Dr. GK, the then Deputy Dean and he who was running the very successful programme came together and presented a paper to the Faculty and University to form an Institute in which the Continuing Engineering Education Committee would be a part. The operations of the Centre, therefore, not only mandated policy changes for itself but for a larger body, the Engineering Institute.

Research Question 4

Relevant information with respect to research question 4 “Did leadership play a role in driving entrepreneurialism in each unit?” was found in two Documents and in responses to interview questions by Prof. CI. At its meeting on October 16, 1986, the Board, Faculty of Engineering received a report from the Continuing Education Committee which gave details of the financial assistance granted in 1985/1986 and a listing of the seminars/short courses held during that academic year (Document 30). In response to interview questions 1 and 2 “Why did the programme start?” and “How did the programme start?” Prof. CI informed that in 1986 when he took over the chairmanship of the Committee he thought that doing five or six courses per year was not enough so he embarked on a strong marketing drive within and outside the University and in about five years time the number of courses moved from six to about twenty and from then on it kept climbing. He boasts that he ran the Committee like a professional organization. He asked for space within the Faculty and he got an office and instead of having secretaries from within the Faculty help in managing the running of the courses, paid staff was hired. As the number of courses increased and the work associated with it increased more staff was hired specifically for the programme. He maintained that

he did not ask for any money for himself because as he put it “I was building”. In response to colleagues who expressed the view that they could not understand why he was putting so much effort into the running of the Committee he mused “in a sense people did not understand that I wanted to do that and I felt a sense of achievement....when I left as Chairman we were turning over two million dollars a year”.

In response to interview question 3 “what were the obstacles preceding the birth and in the early years of the programme? How did you overcome them and did new ones arise?” Prof. CI was very animated. He recalled that he got to know all the people in the newspapers from the Editors down and as such he would call and ask for favours with respect to advertisements for the courses and if by chance a paid advertisement was not presented in a manner which he did not like he would ask for a free advertisement as compensation. As far as the Bursary rules were concerned he admitted that he broke them at will. For example although the Bursary initially did not approve the acceptance of cheques at the Faculty he took them, made a note of what he collected and eventually deposited them at the Bursary. He explained “the bursary would say I can’t do that but I used to do it...they can’t lock me up” When they realized that they could not win they advised that he should make deposits every day which he admitted he also ignored. He argued that persistence on his part paid off in the long run: “as you know in any part of the world when you start something, especially when it goes against the grain you have to stick with it for a long time”.

However, Prof CI admitted that he was a victim of his own success partly because of his leadership style. “I was a victim of my success.... The feeling was CI now wants an empire, he wants to go to a hundred courses, because I was controlling the thing, I would make the decisions although there was a committee, my committee used to agree with me”. He reported that he was even accused of being a dictator by people outside the University “which I was because the people allowed me to do what I wanted and I found it convenient”. His stewardship as chairman came to an end in 1998 when he was appointed Deputy Dean (Undergraduate Affairs/Distance Education) in the Faculty of Engineering (Document 43).

Discussion

Using the findings outlined above, I will now discuss the extent to which they have answered the Research Questions in relation to the literature reviewed.

1. Why and how was each unit created and was each one entrepreneurial in nature from its very beginning?

The evidence unearthed clearly showed that the early years of Continuing Education Committee which later became the Continuing Engineering Education Centre was a typical unit within a traditional university. While the University fell in line with the then world trust of the importance of providing courses in continuing education courses in the engineering field, the unit was not operated as an income generating organization in its early years. The University's main concern then was that the operations of the unit should not incur any additional cost to the Faculty of Engineering. However, the first sign that the unit had the potential to be not only economically feasible but to earn income appeared in 1981 when Prof. CI who was a young lecturer at the time sought and gained permission to mount the seminar on Metal Working. As reported in the findings the income from that seminar not only met all expenses incurred but a healthy surplus was realized.

When Prof CI took over the chairmanship of the committee in 1986, the unit quickly became entrepreneurial in nature. As the findings showed, he was brave enough to take chances and to ignore rules and regulations when he thought it was necessary to do so. Clark (1998, p. xiv) described such action by universities this way:

They adhere to the belief that the risks of experimental change in the character of universities should be chosen over the risks of simply maintaining traditional norms and practices.

Interestingly, it should be noted that in this particular case, Clark's views (the literature) were corroborated by the leadership style of Prof. CI and not the other way around.

The findings showed that the unit was innovative, that the courses and seminars it offered were thought to be pioneering work and it quickly became the entrepreneurial arm of the Faculty of Engineering, at a time when the nation and the faculty were feeling the effects of the then existing difficult economic situation. The surplus generated was used to purchase equipment for the Faculty and to provide extra funding for staff members to attend international conferences. As well, the Centre was not only the forerunner to the Engineering Institute but the findings also showed that it was the main financier of the Institute in its early years.

In addition to the financial contribution of the Centre, the Faculty also enjoyed the benefits of receiving feedback with respect to its degree programmes. The findings showed that the feedback that was received from participants of the short courses and seminars put on by the Centre was much more than what was received when formal sessions for that particular purpose was organized. It can be concluded, therefore, that the Continuing Engineering Education Centre fell into the category of an entrepreneurial unit as posited by Clark (1998, p. 4) who argued that “entrepreneurial universities seek to become ‘stand-up’ universities that are significant actors on their own terms”.

2. What barriers/obstacles were encountered in the creation of each entrepreneurial unit within the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine Campus?

The findings showed that several challenges, barriers and obstacles were encountered during the early years of the Centre. These findings are definitely in keeping with Shattock’s theory “that there are some intrinsic inhibitions which prevent some universities becoming entrepreneurial” (2003, p. 154). However, the University of the West Indies is not unique in this situation. Impediments encountered in the drive to entrepreneurialism by higher education organizations were of such magnitude that Lambert (2006) felt it necessary to present an introductory discussion on entrepreneurialism and its impediments based on

research on twenty-seven university case studies across seven European nations conducted in 2005.

The findings in this particular case showed that the first two challenges that were identified were the fact that the university administration made repeated requests for information regarding the operations of the unit and the appointment of another level of bureaucracy in the form of a Central Committee. The continued request for information seemed to be the administration's way of checking and ensuring that no 'business type' operation was taking place in the Faculty. The reality of that assumption seemed even more plausible when the Bursar reminded the Faculty Dean that no form of payment should be made to lecturers involved in the courses/seminars who were university lecturers. In fact, when it was discovered that payments were being made to lecturers the Bursar immediately stopped payment.

The infrastructure within the Faculty was also a stumbling block to the smooth running of the entrepreneurial unit. The unit experienced difficulty in communicating with prospective clients because of the lack of a proper telephone service and in later years when competitors began to provide similar courses and seminars, participants began complaining about the level of physical amenities that was offered to them during their stay at the Faculty.

The biggest obstacle, however, came from the Bursary who continued to run their operation in a very traditional fashion. Prof. CI complained that although the Bursary eventually paid the expenses incurred in the operation of the unit, the timing was the problem. The fast rate in which business must be conducted in order to satisfy the customer and by so doing stave off the competitors was not in the mindset of Bursary officials. Obviously, from all indications an entrepreneurial unit was being run within a traditional university and therefore problems arose because of the embedded nature of the characteristics of a traditional organization as opposed to the characteristics of a business unit. The attitude and behaviour of Bursary personnel corroborate with what was espoused in the literature by Shattock (2005, p. 21) who reminded that both Clark (2005) and he (2003) showed "how internal bureaucracy and mechanisms of financial

control designed for conventional financial reporting can stifle intrapreneurial activity”.

3. What is the relationship between the entrepreneurial units with the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine and policy formulation?

Explicit evidence of the review of existing policy and the formulation of new policy was presented in the findings. The non-payment to lecturers involved in the programme in 1981 caused two actions to take place. Courses were cancelled that year, obviously because of the withholding of the services by the lecturers involved, but at least it forced the university led by its Vice Chancellor to take a second look at its policy of non-payment. The Board, Faculty of Engineering recommended the payment of an honorarium and the relevant committees eventually relented and agreed on the payment of an honorarium to lecturers involved. Additionally, policy was formulated so that lecturers involved also shared in the surplus funds after the payment of 15% to the University.

The Bursary, which had been identified as the greatest challenge to the smooth running of the unit actually relented and after discussions with the Chairman agreed to a relaxation of the rule that they alone should collect payment on behalf of the Centre. However, along with the measures agreed upon they were actually able to strike a deal in which they were able to get the unit management to buy equipment for the Bursary from funds generated from their entrepreneurial activities.

There was evidence as well of the disbanding of a layer of bureaucracy when the University restructured in 1984 – the Campus Committee on Continuing Education. It should be borne in mind that the Faculty of Engineering was against the establishment of that layer when it was first suggested and thrust upon them. Finally, new policy also had to be formulated when the Engineering Institute was established.

To conclude, therefore, based on all the evidence presented, there is in fact a direct relationship between the birth of the entrepreneurial unit and policy formulation.

4. Did leadership play a role in driving entrepreneurialism in each unit?

Shattock (2005, p.18) argued that entrepreneurialism “needs to be seen not only as an institutional characteristic”. He reminded that there was a substantial literature which was quoted in Kirby (2003) which was devoted to “intrapreneurs” in the business world. He described intrapreneurs as “entrepreneurial individuals who are able to innovate within traditional large organizations, and who do so by challenging bureaucracy and creating successful operations in spite of, rather than in line with, the organizational culture and strategic aims of the company. In a sense Prof. CI fits in to that description. His leadership style was such that he was not only unafraid to challenge the bureaucratic system but actually went a step further and broke the rules whenever he thought it necessary. He admitted that from the time that he took over he ran the unit in a professional manner. He asked for and was granted his own space within the Faculty and got the university administration to hire staff whose remuneration was paid from funds earned in the Centre. He was passionate about the Centre and as such did not solicit compensation for the work he was doing in leading and managing it nor did he bother too much that the university’s appraisal system did not reward the effort and work that he was putting into the running of the Centre. Prof. CI eventually conceded that he was a victim of his own success and was eventually classified as a dictator to which he did not object.

The findings suggest that the leadership provided by Prof. CI contributed significantly to the success of the Centre from 1986 onwards. In this particular case leadership played a major role in driving entrepreneurialism in the unit.

As indicated in the introduction to this chapter, the Continuing Engineering Education Centre was a different type of unit to the Summer Programme Units in the Faculties of Social Sciences, Humanities and Education and Science and Agriculture. While the clientele of the Summer Programmes were either

undergraduate students or prospective undergraduate students, the clientele of the Continuing Engineering Education Centre consisted mainly of engineering graduates who were interested in keeping abreast of engineering education. However, the findings in this particular case, bearing the research questions in mind, were very similar to the findings in the Summer Programme cases. This unit was another entrepreneurial unit within a traditional organization that was forcing the university into becoming entrepreneurial in nature.

CHAPTER 8

HEALTH ECONOMICS UNIT

In 1995, in addition to continuing engineering education and summer schools, another type of entrepreneurship surfaced at the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine. The Health Economics Unit, an entrepreneurial unit that concentrated on research, consultancy and training, came into being. The findings and discussion of this case study will now be presented.

Findings

Research Question 1

Information with respect to Research Question 1 “Why and how was each unit created and was each one entrepreneurial in nature from its very beginning” was found in four Documents and in responses to the interview questions. The Health Economics Unit came into being in 1995 (Documents 1 & 2). In a letter dated June 20, 1995 the University Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences, Dr. KT wrote to the then Vice Chancellor Sir AMI to advise him of the formation of the Health Economics Unit (HEU) within the Department of Economics. Dr. KT advised the Vice Chancellor that the:

“establishment of the Unit is consistent with the determination of the Faculty to adopt a more structural approach to the research and consultancy of its staff members. The new Unit also reflects the decision of the Department of Economics to establish a number of research clusters among its different staff members. The HEU comprises at the moment three members of staff and is coordinated by me, in my capacity as the senior researcher in this area. In my own view, the HEU will be an efficient vehicle to consolidate teaching, research and policy support in the area of Health Economics....The aim is to make the UWI a centre of excellence in this area and to demonstrate in a tangible way the UWI’s commitment to improving the quality of policy implementation in the region”.

A memorandum dated July 10, 1995 was also written by Dr. KT to Prof. G in the Department of Community Medicine, Faculty of Medical Sciences informing him of the establishment of the Health Economics Unit in the Department of Economics and advising that the “unit will seek to consolidate the work of the Department in this important area and will strive to establish and maintain a high quality of teaching, research and policy support. In order to carry out its work the Unit will need to collaborate with other teachers and researchers within the UWI, especially with the Faculty of Medicine”.

In 1997, two years after the formation of the Unit, a surplus was recorded with respect to the operations of the Unit. A statement of account of the Unit dated October 21, 1997 which was prepared and approved by officials of the Bursary recorded a surplus of TT\$40,015.01 (Document 3). By 2000 the Unit had completed a substantial amount of work (Document 29) since the annual report of the Unit for the period August 1, 1999 to July 31, 2000 provided the following figures:

Research completed	4
Research in progress	6
Ongoing Research	11
Dissemination of research output	11
Publications	8
Other activities	7

When the Health Economics Unit was scheduled to be part of the Management Audit Work Flow for the financial year 2001/2002, the Coordinator in a letter dated October 18, 2001 to the Senior Auditor explained the background to the Health Economics Unit (HEU), job classification of members of the unit and the status of selected activities/initiatives (Document 35). He explained that the HEU started as one of five (5) clusters in the Department of Economics and operated with the status of a “project”. “As such, the Unit/Project does not have full time, long term staff. Instead, the services of individuals and organizations - including UWI staff – are sourced based on the existence of and needs of a given project”. With respect to office space, he advised that “from the time of its inception in May, 1995 the Unit has never been allocated office space” but operated out of his

office which had resulted in “a number of direct effects of the ‘invasion’ of his office space by the Unit”. With respect to the status of the HEU activities/initiatives, he informed that “the unit does both funded and non-funded research including consultancies”.

The unit was established based on what the Coordinator saw as a need in the region and decided to do something about it. In response to interview question 1 “Why did the Unit start?” Prof. KT advised that “my sense was the health sector reform programmes (in the region) were not really working.... and I thought that one of the reasons that it wasn’t working was because some aspects of the programme seem to require a fair amount of technical analysis on issues....I knew about it because different countries had approached me as an individual to give them support on their programmes, but it became clear to me that this is not a one person thing. This is why the idea of the unit came....So it grew out of a real need, a need that I saw”.

Prof. KT further advised that the ability of the Unit to provide technical support was supported by a couple of the Ministers of Health in the region and in particular the Minister of Health in Jamaica at that time who was of the view that while traditionally the CARICOM countries relied heavily on international personnel to provide technical support, there were people in the region who seemed able to help them. His belief was probably based on the fact that Prof KT and his team of five other persons (which eventually constituted the Health Economics Unit) had completed a successful piece of work for the Jamaican government in 1995. However, the unit from inception had to be self sufficient since as Prof KT explained that “the Vice Chancellor made it very clear that the University didn’t have funds to give us any posts so we had to find a way, we had to get projects to pay for ...if we want to pay for our Research Assistants, our Administrative Assistant... to pay for those things we had to find the funds for ourselves and that was a challenge, that was real challenging”. The unit not only sustained itself but in order to ease the burden of the Coordinator, who had a full teaching load in the Department of Economics, got the Department to agree with the Coordinator’s proposal to hire a part time lecturer to teach one or two of his

courses, with the understanding that that person's salary would be paid from income generated by the Health Economics Unit.

Additional evidence with respect to the entrepreneurial nature of the unit was provided by Prof. KT in response to interview question 8 "what do you think were the factors that led to these successes?" He argued that the good fit between the idea of the Health Economics Unit and the need that existed, the commitment to the quality of the work and the attitude of the people in the Unit all contributed to the Unit's ability to sustain itself from its inception. He was adamant that "if we are doing good service money will come, so we are not to go out there hunting money....sustaining yourself would never be a problem since if you do good work, it will be paid for". In response to interview question 9 "Are there any other thoughts about the unit that you would like to share with me?" Prof KT indirectly referred to the coming together of research and business in a higher education setting. He confirmed that "we never lost sight of the fact that our primary purpose was doing good research work....I mean I don't think we should ever lose sight of the fact that we are not consulting firms, we are not consulting companies; we are research units that are doing technical work for people".

Research Question 2

As far as research question 2 "What barriers/obstacles were encountered in the creation of each entrepreneurial unit within the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine?" was concerned twelve Documents and the responses to the interview questions provided information that suggests that the unit faced what could be deemed as challenges rather than barriers or obstacles. The first challenge that the unit encountered was cash flow problems. The first measure that was taken by the unit to deal with that problem was a request by the Coordinator for a temporary waiver of the Common Services/ Administration fee that was payable to the University. By letter dated December 16, 1997 to the Bursar, the Coordinator made the request but promised that "once the HEU found its legs....we would be more than willing to contribute to the overall expenses of the university" (Document 4). Subsequently, three requests were made for the approval of payments when the required funds were not yet available. The first request was made in May, 2001 (Document 30). The Coordinator wrote to the Accountant

(Projects) with respect to the financial position of the Health Economics Unit. He admitted that the Unit account was in deficit by an estimated TT\$53,000 but that arrangements had been made for two transfers amounting to TT\$44,000. Additionally, funds from two ongoing projects totaling more than US\$31,000 were expected. Based on that information the Coordinator asked the Bursary to approve attached payments and those that the bursary were then holding. The second request was made in a memorandum dated March 4, 2002 from the Coordinator, Health Economics Unit to the Accountant (Projects). The memorandum provided a status report on the position of the HEU with respect to the inflow of funds which indicated that a total of US\$231,200 was expected based on projects in the pipeline. The Coordinator therefore asked to be facilitated a bit further “for at least another month” (Document 36). In a memorandum dated September 11, 2002 from the Assistant Coordinator of the HEU to the Accountant (Projects), she indicated that the HEU was committed to reducing the current deficit of TT\$11,900 and that a deposit of TT\$15,000 would be made by the end of September of that year. On that basis she asked for the Unit to be facilitated a bit further with respect to expenses that were being incurred on the account (Document 37). However, in an effort to alleviate cash flow and other problems, the Audit Report of the Health Economics Unit which was done by the Management Audit Unit for the period 1997/1998 to 2000/2001 commented and made recommendations with respect to the budgeting and management of cash flow, the inadequate organizational structure, HEU projects versus personal projects and the limited office space available to the Unit (Document 38).

The second challenge that confronted the Health Economics Unit was problems with respect to the payment of compulsory government deductions for administrative staff members in the Unit which ultimately led to the discovery of a bigger problem – the fact that the Unit was breaking University regulations with respect to the manner in which such staff were hired. The Coordinator by letter dated June 25, 2001 (Document 31) advised the Bursar that he had been verbally informed that the administrative staff members in the HEU were not subjected to statutory deductions. However, based on a recent newspaper advertisement he requested the Bursar’s assistance in regularizing the arrangement for compulsory government deductions to be made from the full time members of staff in the

Unit. As a result of the request from the Coordinator, the Bursar in a memorandum dated June 27, 2001 enquired from the Accountant (Projects) whether the persons named in the Coordinator's letter of June 25, 2001 held letters of appointment issued by the University or whether they were paid on an ad-hoc basis (Document 32). On July 5, 2001, the Accountant, in a letter to the Campus Bursar confirmed that unfortunately the Health Economics Unit administrative staff held letters of appointment that were issued by the Department and not the University (Document 33). He explained that there was a myth that project staff were not deemed to be University employees, but rather employees of the project (funded by a Sponsor). He advised the Bursar that the legal entity was in fact the University of the West Indies. However, it was not until December 2, 2003 that the Coordinator was formally notified by the Accountant (Projects) that all appointments in the HEU should be made through the Human Resource Department of the University, so that the payment of salaries including the payment of statutory deductions could be done in a systematic fashion. The Coordinator was also reminded that although the Unit was self-financing it was under the auspices of the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine and as such the system of payment of staff by vouchers was not in compliance with the University's procedures on the payment of salaries (Document 39). On December 10, 2003 the Coordinator acknowledged the receipt of the memorandum from the Accountant (Projects) with a promise to put things in place to comply with the University's procedures on the payment of salaries (Document 40). Measures were obviously taken to formally appoint the administrative staff through the Human Resource Department but the cash flow problem reared its head again when on June 11, 2004 the Coordinator wrote the Bursar requesting her to facilitate the regularization of the HEU administrative/clerical staff although the requisite funds for the entire period were not yet available (Document 43).

The third challenge that the Health Economics Unit faced was the lack of support from the University Administration from its inception although there was no objection to its formation. In response to interview question 2 "How did the Unit start?" Prof. KT explained that in the mid 1990s a member of staff in the Department of Economics had been suggesting that staff members should come

up with a research agenda for the Department, but there was resistance from some members of staff. However, Prof KT felt that if a few people in the department could agree to work in certain areas together, you could probably have clusters, research clusters. He went on “if the Department doesn’t object we could set up a health cluster, a health economics cluster. They had no objections”. On his return to Trinidad early in 1995 from Jamaica where he and a team had gone to carry out an assignment for the Jamaican Government, Prof. KT reported that he told the then Head of Department that “these research clusters we have been talking about, I am going to set it up....we are going to set up a thing called A Health Economics Unit.... Is there an objection? The Department had no objection, they couldn’t give any other support but they had no objection”. Prof. KT explained that he then went to the Vice Chancellor with his idea of forming the Unit. The Vice Chancellor acknowledged that the idea was a good one and that he did not have any objections but was not in a position to offer any kind of support to the Unit.

Hesitance on the part of the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) was identified as the fourth challenge faced by the Unit. The IDB was the funding agency for the study that was undertaken for the Jamaican Government and Professor KT reported that they the IDB were not keen on having him and his team of five recently graduated M.Sc. students do the job since they did not know about them, but the Jamaican government insisted that they knew them. A compromise was arrived at when the Government got the IDB to agree that if Prof. KT’s team was allowed to do the job they (the IDB) would be allowed to circulate the final report to different persons to get their views with respect to the quality of the document. Prof. KT reported that when the reviews came back they were very glowing and confessed that it was as a result of that event that the idea of the Unit hit him.

In response to interview question 3 “What were the obstacles preceding the birth and in the early years of this unit? How did you overcome them and did new ones arise?” Prof KT identified two concerns – the fifth challenge. He explained that the first concern was that since he was a full time member of staff in the Department of Economics he had a full teaching load. He sought to get a lighter load because of his involvement with the Health Economics Unit but it was not

possible based on the demand of the Department. He eventually got the Department to agree to the hiring of a part time lecturer to teach two of his courses although there was objection from one or two members of the staff who were not in agreement because they were not sure about the capability of the chosen person. However, in spite of the objections the Head of Department went along with the proposal of the hiring of the part time staff member with the understanding that the remuneration would be paid from funds realized by the Health Economics Unit. The second concern identified by Prof KT was the issue of staff retention. Since there was no funding from the University, you could technically only hire staff when the Unit got a project. He therefore had to rely on the goodwill of his Head of Department and the Bursary in order to keep his staff. He explained "...the Bursary really held our hands and there were times when it appeared that funds were not coming in at all and we had our research assistants to pay and they kept us going for a few months to see if something would happen and something always happened.... And we would pay off and so...that worked very, very well".

The sixth challenge faced by the Unit was the fact that clients in the region were prepared to pay the going rate to consultants from outside the region but were not always willing to pay the same to "home grown persons". Prof. KT recognized that the culture of the region accounted for that kind of behaviour but admitted that "one of the good things that happened to us was that in the early days the people we had, they didn't seem to have an attitude that the money was the important factor they realized the work was important". However the seventh challenge was faced when the Unit expanded and more people were employed. In response to interview question 4 "Were there any perverse outcomes for anybody?" Prof KT explained that with the expansion of employment within the Unit that there was a young lady with a different attitude from what they were used to. She was of the view that the Unit should have been charging more for its services and it was therefore the Unit's fault that they were sometimes short on cash. He argued that he had to get rid of her since he was of the view that she would have infected the rest of his staff.

In spite of the challenges identified above, Prof KT admitted in response to interview question 5 “Did you feel you had the full support of the University’s administration during the early years of the Unit?” that it could have been worse but recognized that the University Administration although not supportive with respect to financial or human resource, provided moral support by not putting up bureaucratic obstacles in the Unit’s way. However, he recognized that he could have been blocked. He posited: “I know if people in UWI want to block you they could definitely do so, they could definitely block you and I realize that that did not happen to us at all. We didn’t get block along the way and that I think was a stroke of luck”. In response to interview question 8 “What do you think were the factors that led to these successes?” Prof KT acknowledged his supportive and committed staff who worked long hours to ensure the on-time delivery of all projects which eliminated the challenge of late delivery of projects.

Finally, in response to interview question 9 “Are there any other thoughts about the unit you would like to share with me?” Prof. KT reiterated that while there was understanding from the top, at the level of the Vice Chancellor, there was nothing that he could do to help him to face the eighth challenge – the loss of top class staff to organizations that provided more secure employment and better remuneration packages. In light of that fact, he again approached the Vice Chancellor for help. He explained that he told the Vice Chancellor that the University needed to establish some posts in the Health Economics Unit, so that staff members could eventually be eligible for security of tenure, but the VC informed him that the position had not changed since the University simply did not have the funds to do so.

Research Question 3

Relevant information with respect to Research Question 3 “What is the relationship between the entrepreneurial units within the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine and policy formulation?” was found in sixteen Documents and in responses to the interview questions. As far as policy was concerned Prof KT was of the view that since the Health Economics Unit was an invention, the Administration was not quite sure how to deal with it. He posited: “I don’t think we had anything like this before so they didn’t know how to deal with us and

thank God they did not put any obstacles in our way”. A proposal and acceptance of a variation of the Common Services Fee was identified as the first policy change that took place during the early years of the establishment of the Health Economic Unit. In a letter dated January 6, 1998 (Document 5), the Coordinator of the Health Economics Unit (HEU) wrote to the Campus Bursar advising that the Health Economics Unit had been invited by the Government of St. Vincent and the Grenadines to carry out a number of studies on the design of its proposed National Health Insurance Plan. He further advised that the HEU had agreed to undertake the exercise at very modest rates of remuneration since the government would not be obtaining any external aid to carry out the studies and partly because “of our vision of the role of the UWI in the Caribbean”. In light of that situation the Coordinator asked that the Bursary to accept a fixed payment instead of a percentage of total expenses incurred. The Coordinator ended his letter by stating that “for us this will be a gesture of support for the entrepreneurial efforts of the Unit as well as a sign of commitment of the UWI to the development of the region”. The Bursar responded within two weeks (Document 6) advising that “a project of the quantum involved should normally be charged a twenty percent (20%) common service fee” but because of the special circumstances that were identified he agreed to a charge of ten percent (10%). However, following renewed negotiations between the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Health, St. Vincent and the Grenadines and the Coordinator of the HEU a revised budget was sent to the Permanent Secretary on (Document 7) and copied to the Campus Bursar (Document 8). Following that, the Bursar wrote to the Coordinator of the Health Economics Unit on March 18, 1998 and advised that he had agreed to a revised common services charge of a fixed amount (rather than a percentage) after he had reviewed the budget and based on the points raised in the discussion between the both of them (Document 9). In a letter dated May 22, 1998 to the Bursar, the Coordinator of the HEU not only accepted the Bursar’s recommendation of the fixed figure for the common services fee but advised that the first cheque in relation to the project had been received and asked for a project account to be established (Document 10). The Bursar agreed to the request for a special account possibly since there had been precedent of a change in policy with respect to the establishment of special accounts for the HEU earlier that year and advised the HEU Coordinator of the account numbers to be used on June 16, 1998

(Document 11). Evidence of the receipt of payment, the deposit of the payment into the special account and the use of the funds to cover expenses associated with the project were seen in correspondence from August to November, 1998 between the Coordinator and the Bursary (Documents 23, 24,25 and 26).

The second policy change identified was the request by the Coordinator of the HEU on February 9, 1998 for a special project account to be set up for its seminar which was carded for March 27, 1998 entitled “Pension Reform in the English-speaking Caribbean: Lessons from the Experience of Chile and the rest of Latin America”. The Coordinator argued that “this is an effort to facilitate the disbursement and receipt of funds for the above mentioned “high profile” seminar” (Document 12). The Coordinator followed up this request with a formal letter to the Bursar on February 18, 1998 advising him of the proposed seminar on Pension Reform. He further advised that the Minister of Social Development had agreed to open the seminar and that two keynote speakers from the University of Pittsburgh and the Pension Fund Companies in Chile. In view of the fact that the HEU had been soliciting financial assistance from general quarters and had already been assured of US\$1500 from the Vice Chancellor, he was requesting that monies collected to defray the expenses of the seminar be treated differently from the normal inflow to the HEU account (Document 13). The Bursar agreed and by the next day, February 19, the Acting Accountant, Credit Management and Special Projects wrote to the Coordinator of the HEU advising him of the account numbers to be used with respect to the Pension Reform Seminar (Document 14).

The eventual recognition by the Inter-American Development Bank of the ability of the Health Economics Unit (HEU) after it had initially questioned the Unit’s ability led to the identification of the third policy change that the HEU was the preferred agency with respect to work pertaining to health economic policy and reform in the Caribbean. The HEU moved from being an unknown identity by the IDB to the signing of a contract between the IDB and the HEU for a short term consultancy on January 29, 1999 (Document 27). A sum equivalent to 33% of the total amount upon acceptance and signing of the contract with the IDB was sent by the Coordinator of the HEU to the Campus Bursar for deposit into the HEU’s account on February 23, 1999 (Document 28). In response to interview question 6

“Who were the persons who accessed the services of the unit?” Prof KT identified the Inter-American Development Bank, the World Bank, the Pan American Health Organization and the World Health Organization. He added that “whoever was doing something in the region they really came to us so we did quite a lot of work for international and regional bodies”. However, in response to interview question 7 “What have been the main successes of the unit?” Prof. KT’s response was “the single main success I think is that, I think all the Ministries of Health in the region now know that when it comes to certain kinds of work that they need to do that the HEU would be the place to go to....I mean they just come to us so that sort of recognition as being the agency that deals with these matters for this region”.

Although the Vice Chancellor was not in a position to help, he had the ability to foresee the formulation of the policy with respect to the use of the Health Economics Unit as the internship agency for young graduates in the region with an interest in health economics. In response to interview question 1 “Why did the unit start?” admitted that the Vice Chancellor although unable to help “quite liked the idea, because he suggested to me at the time, he said one of the things that could happen is that if we set up a unit like this then it means that the fifteen Ministries of Health in the region.... we could ask them to start sending their people to spend some time with you and we could be strengthening the region”. As it turned out Prof KT informed that that was exactly what was happening at the moment. He advised that over the last four years the Unit have always had someone from a Ministry of Health working with them. In response to interview question 7 “What have been the main successes of the unit?” Prof. KT identified the Unit’s role in the grooming of young people as its second success story. He added “the word spread that if you worked for us there was a very good chance after you worked for us you would get a good job somewhere else and I think what that meant was that a number of young, bright people saw us as a place they would come to work for first, it would make for a good beginning”.

Finally, Prof. KT made a recommendation with respect to policy as far as engagement with the University’s stakeholders was concerned. In response to interview question 9 “Are there any other thoughts about the unit you would like

to share with me?” Prof KT was of the view that units like the Health Economics Unit “are the entities that could take the University into the backyards of the countries and help them with specific problems”. He went on “I keep saying that in many ways the HEU model is the one that UWI should follow...you can’t be just writing papers and sending them to get published, that is not the way you have to be engaged..... so we are doing our research, but we also doing what is necessary to help the countries of this region lift themselves up and to solve their problems”.

Research Question 4

With respect to research question 4 “Did leadership play a role in driving entrepreneurialism in each unit?” relevant information was found in responses to the interview questions and in sixteen Documents. First of all evidence of the innovative and futuristic nature of the founder and Coordinator of the Health Economics Unit was first established in his responses to interview questions 1 and 2 “Why did the unit start?” and “How did the Unit start?”. He admitted that the Unit “came out of recognition that there was a need in the region that was not being served” and in order to satisfy that need the Unit was established. Although he did not have all the necessary resources at hand he decided that “we going to set up a thing called a Health Economics Unit and I know exactly, myself alone as a staff member, but I am having these five graduate students working with me”. Prof. KT can also be described as a risk taker since by the time he had decided to form the Unit he had already taken the risky decision of agreeing to undertake a project in Jamaica with his recently graduated students. He confessed that when the Jamaicans called him in early 1995 to do some work for them “I told them well look because of the nature of the work, you really would need a bigger team and I asked them well, could I bring a team. They said do you have a team. I said yes, I have a team. Mind you my five graduate students never went anywhere before, they just graduated but I knew they were good so I took them to Jamaica with me”.

By 1998, three years after the establishment of the Unit the Coordinator not only continued to have the moral support of the Vice Chancellor who finally became a financial supporter, but had also gained the respect of the business community in

Trinidad and Tobago. This was borne out by the response he got to his appeal for financial assistance in the staging of what he termed a “high profile” seminar on Pension Reform. In addition to US\$1500 from the Vice Chancellor there was evidence of contributions from the business sector of at least TT\$17,000 (Documents 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 & 22).

Evidence of his persistent nature also surfaced in 2000 when he made his first official request to the University administration for the consolidation of the Health Economics Unit (Document 34). The consolidation context read in part:

“For the past six years the Health Economics Unit (HEU) has operated as a research cluster of the Department of Economics at St. Augustine. Although it was directed by a senior member of staff of the Department, to date none of its positions has been funded by the UWI. Project and grant funds provided the resources necessary for its work. Given the extent of its activities in the region, and in particular, its recent work in the area of HIV/AIDS, it is now obvious that the HEU needs to be consolidated within the UWI structure if it is to continue making the contribution required by the region. One aspect of consolidation is obviously in respect of the tenure of the HEU’s research and administrative positions. It will be impossible to hold on to quality human resources if only short term appointments are available. There is a clear need therefore to put the HEU on a different footing”.

Although, he did not get a positive response from the University at that time he persisted with his mission to get the necessary financial support for the Unit and in April 2004 the Campus Principal received a letter from the Assistant Secretary General, Human and Social Development of the World Bank advising that the World Bank had approved a grant to the Pan Caribbean Partnership Against HIV/AIDS and that included a component for the Health Economics Unit (HEU). He further advised the Principal that since with the grant there was an allocation for the building and works of the HEU, he asked that the architectural drawings for the relevant construction be fast tracked (Document 4). In addition to the support from the World Bank, Prof KT’s requests for funded staff in the HEU

continued even further. In response to interview question 9 “Are there any other thoughts about the unit you would like to share with me?” Prof KT reported that in response to his appeal to the Vice Chancellor for help during the period when he was losing good staff to other organizations, the Vice Chancellor admitted that he was unable to offer assistance in the form of funded posts, but advised him to seek help from the Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago. Prof. KT followed the Vice Chancellor’s advice and wrote to the Prime Minister in 2003 and by 2005 he got approval for funded posts in the HEU.

More evidence of the Coordinator’s continued persistence continued to surface. When Prof KT realized that the money from the World Bank for the building was insufficient he admitted that he went back to the Government and asked “could you give us the rest of the money to build the building and they agreed”. In a letter dated March 13, 2006 the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Science, Technology and Tertiary Education wrote to the Coordinator of the Health Economics Unit advising that Cabinet at its meeting on February 23, 2006 had agreed to not only provide funding on an annual basis to meet the cost of recurrent expenditure but had also agreed to cover the shortfall in the capital cost of constructing and outfitting of the Regional Training Facility of the HEU (Document 44). The Coordinator of the HEU informed the Campus Principal of the good news (Document 45) and the Principal in turn wrote congratulating the Coordinator on his ability to access funding from the Government of Trinidad and Tobago (Document 46). In May 2006 the Coordinator wrote to the Vice Chancellor formally applying to have the HEU recognized as an autonomous entity for administrative purposes within the University of the West Indies. He reiterated that the Unit was established in 1995 as one of the research clusters in the Department of Economics and that the clusters were expected to be self-financing with no dedicated administrative support or full time staff. However, based on the support of the Government of Trinidad and Tobago and based on the advice from the Bursar at the St. Augustine Campus the preference was for the funds of the Government of Trinidad and Tobago to be allocated to the HEU as a University Centre Project on the St. Augustine Campus (Document 47). The Vice Chancellor acknowledged receipt of the request (Document 48) and in a memorandum dated January 30, 2008 the University Registrar informed the

Campus Principal designate that the University's Finance and General Purposes Committee (F&GPC) had approved in principle that the HEU be recognized as a semi-autonomous entity with established core staff and secure funding by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago (Document 50).

Finally, in response to interview question 9 "Are there any other thoughts about the unit you would like to share with me?" evidence of his unselfish nature and his passion for the work of the Health Economic Unit surfaced. Prof. KT informed that one of the posts that was granted was the post of Director of the HEU "but since I am heading the unit and I am part of the Department (Economics) that money we say we will use that money to bring in somebody else for the time being". He summed up his love for his work with the HEU this way:

But it has been an interesting experience and I think personally, I think setting up the HEU and working with the HEU made my life as an economist, a kind of fulfillment, it gave me the opportunity to do the kind of work that you really believe you should have been doing all your life, to really make a difference for peopleyou not only writing reports, you know you are helping them to change policy and to do the things differently and so on and that for me is personally very satisfying.

Discussion

The extent to which the findings outlined above have answered the Research Questions in relation to the literature reviewed will now be discussed.

1. Why and how was each unit created and was each one entrepreneurial in nature from its very beginning?

From the findings outlined above, the Health Economics Unit was born because of what the 'inventor' saw as a need waiting to be satisfied by the organization that regional governments had been supporting since its existence – the University of the West Indies. However, he confirmed that he was aware from the very beginning that the unit had to be self sufficient since it was not possible at that time for any kind of support from the University. The Unit, therefore, had no

alternative but to be entrepreneurial in nature from its inception and the evidence confirmed that within two years of its existence a surplus was realized. As a result of that it was possible to pay for the services of a lecturer in order to lighten the teaching load of the Coordinator who held a full time job in the Department of Economics. Although the Unit enjoyed financial success Prof KT was adamant that the Unit's first priority was not to go after money but to provide a good service and because of that "money will come". The Coordinator's view of how entrepreneurialism in a higher education setting should be characterized is supported in the literature. Rinne and Koivula (2005, p. 112) reiterated the views espoused by Shattock (2003) that "universities should function in an entrepreneurial fashion, but in an academic sense, not in an economic sense". Indeed, as far as entrepreneurialism in universities was concerned Shattock (2003 p. 156) was clear. He argued that "being entrepreneurial means first, being entrepreneurial in academic matters not in finance; financial success follows academic success, and reinforces it, but cannot create it". The operations of the Health Economic Unit bear testimony to that view.

2. What barriers/obstacles were encountered in the creation of each entrepreneurial unit within the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine Campus?

The evidence provided in the findings identified challenges rather than barriers and obstacles in this particular case. However, the fact that it was possible to have barriers and obstacles did not escape the Coordinator. He was grateful that he did not have to deal with such issues and concentrated his energies in dealing with the challenges that the Unit faced along the way. The support of the Bursary with respect to the Unit's cash flow problems was clearly seen and when the problems arose with respect to the statutory deductions from administrative staff members in the Unit, the manner in which the Bursary officials handled the situation again provided evidence of their support.

The challenge of being an unknown entity as far as the Inter-American Development Bank was concerned, the cultural issue of less pay for nationals as opposed to consultants from abroad and the staff retention problem can all be

added to the list of impediments to university entrepreneurialism which was prepared by Lambert (2006) for his introductory discussion on entrepreneurialism and its impediments. He identified approximately one hundred and seventy-five inhibiting factors that were explicitly cited within the case studies that were carried out for the European Universities for Entrepreneurship: their role in the Europe of Knowledge (EUEREK) project. The Health Economics Unit which is centered within the University of the West Indies whose 'parent' was the University of London, a European University is no exception but because of the leadership and moral support for the Unit, the challenges were successfully dealt with.

3. What is the relationship between the entrepreneurial units within the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine and policy formulation?

The issue of the relationship between policy formulation and entrepreneurial units was broached quite succinctly by Prof. KT in his statement that the unit was an invention and as such the university administration did not quite know how to deal with them. As such, after much discussion the Bursary initially reduced the common services fee for the St. Vincent and the Grenadines project from 20% to 10% and eventually agreed to a fixed sum instead of 10%. Precedent has always been a deciding factor in traditional organizations. The Bursary's decision to lower the common services fee and its agreement to allocate separate account numbers for some projects inevitably lead to its altering of the policy for other projects. The idea envisaged by the Vice Chancellor that the Unit could be a place where persons from the Ministries of Health in the region could serve as interns actually became policy since Prof KT admitted that an internship programme had been in operation since 2004. The revision of existing policy and the formulation of new ones allowed the Unit to cement its place within the establishment of the University. That situation gave credence to the views expressed by Davies (1987) and Clark (1998) that once the benefits of entrepreneurialism in higher education are realized and enjoyed it is difficult to stop the process.

4. Did Leadership play a role in driving entrepreneurialism in each unit?

Evidence from the findings point to the key role played by the inventor and coordinator of the Health Economics Unit, Prof. KT. He was the person who moved the idea of the Unit from a thought to reality. It all started with the risky decision that he made in taking the five recently graduated M.Sc. students to Jamaica for their first project. Along the way he used his negotiating skills (the eventual reduction of the common services fee), his ability to act decisively when necessary (the termination of the contract of the 'poisonous' employee), his persistence (establishment of funded posts in the Unit) and his passion for the work of the Unit (the HEU model should be the one UWI should follow) to ensure that the Unit not only stayed on course but led to its becoming a successful entity. The Unit was therefore not only managed by Prof KT but it was expertly led by him. The leadership provided by Prof. KT definitely played a key role in driving entrepreneurialism in the Health Economics Unit.

The findings and discussion of this chapter indicate that entrepreneurial activity at the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine had moved beyond the provision of courses for a fee. The entrepreneurial activity that the Health Economics Unit was engaged in brought the University closer to its major stakeholder, the funding Governments. The social engagement that took place in the region because of the Unit brought the University in line with the principles and practices of the 3rd mission that some universities in the United States had so effectively used in transforming their organizations into entrepreneurial universities. However, the evidence provided in the findings indicates that the Health Economics Unit profited from the four other entrepreneurial units. One example of this was the relationship between the Unit and Bursary which seemed much more cordial than the relationship between the Continuing Engineering Education Centre and the Bursary.

CHAPTER 9

COMPARATIVE DISCUSSION

A comparative discussion of the five cases that were investigated will now be undertaken using the four research questions as the base for the discussion i.e reasons for the birth and development of each unit, barriers and/or challenges encountered along the way, policy formulation and leadership. Since the ultimate aim of this study is not only to disprove Clark's assumption, but to provide a blueprint for traditional universities to follow in their quest to become entrepreneurial, a comparative discussion will ultimately provide a summarized version of what transpired before, during and after the birth of each.

REASONS FOR BIRTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF EACH UNIT

The official reason for the birth of the Faculty of Social Sciences Summer Programme was to give students who had failed courses during the semester an opportunity to repeat the course(s) and move on with their degree. However, Dr. PK, the Deputy Dean (Student Matters) insisted that when he went to the Academic Board for approval to mount the programme, it was not only for failing students. He was more interested in bringing in persons who were outside of the University because of the popularity of the Social Sciences courses: demand outweighed supply with respect to that Faculty. He acknowledged the fact that students used it as an alternative to the discontinued supplemental examinations but argued that it was not the main reason for the programme. Additionally, Dr. PK insisted that he was interested in capturing the additional market of North American students and Trinidadian and Tobagonian students who returned home during the summer months. Dr. PK explained that he drove home the point of no extra cost to the University in his effort to gain acceptance by the relevant university bodies but his ultimate aim was to capture an existing unfulfilled market. His view that the summer programme "was a business opportunity just waiting to be ignited" is in line with his real reason for starting the programme. It therefore suggests that not just income was on his mind but profit as well.

The main reason for the birth of the Faculty of Humanities and Education Summer Programme was similar to the official reason for the Social Sciences programme i.e. a recovery programme for students who had failed courses during the Semester. However, the then Dean of the Faculty not only acknowledged that the Faculty of Social Sciences was the pioneer of the Summer Programme, but admitted that his Faculty noted the financial returns that they (Social Sciences) enjoyed which his Faculty was not in a position to enjoy prior to the birth of its own programme. Unlike Social Sciences, the main clientele of the Humanities and Education Summer Programme was school teachers whose school vacation coincided with the Summer Programme timeframe. Many teachers took advantage of the programme to not only recover from failure but to fast track their degree programmes. This facilitated the Faculty's second reason for the programme which was to facilitate throughput.

An opportunity for students to recover from failure was also given as the main reason for the birth of the Summer Programme in the Faculty of Science and Agriculture and the main clientele in this case was in fact students who had failed courses during the semester. The Senior Administrative Assistant bemoaned the fact that unlike Social Sciences it was difficult to package Science and Agriculture courses (mainly because of the lab component) which made it almost impossible for members of the public to access courses during the summer in that Faculty. However, one aspect of commonality among the three Faculty Summer Programmes was their ability not only to sustain themselves but to realize profit, some of which was used to provide funding for activities, plant and equipment in their respective faculties.

The theory of institutional isomorphism (Di Maggio & Powell, (1983) which seeks to explain how various contextual factors influence organizational change among institutions has been applied to various contexts such as community-based programmes (Townsend & Campbell, 2007) crime analysis units (Giblin, 2006), the healthcare industry (Borkowski & Gordon, 2006) and the German Public Administration system (Lodge & Wegrich, 2005). The birth of the Social Sciences Summer Programme and the subsequent birth of the two other programmes corroborate Di Maggio's & Powell's theory. They explained that there were three

mechanisms of institutional isomorphic change namely coercive isomorphism which resulted “from both formal and informal pressures exerted on organizations by other organizations upon which they are dependent”, mimetic processes (modeling) “when the environment creates symbolic uncertainty” and normative pressures “which stems primarily from professionalization”. The evidence presented with respect to the Summer Programmes indicates a clear case of modeling which eventually resulted in the spread of entrepreneurialism among three faculties. The three faculties were faced with the same situations – the semester system had replaced the year long system and government funding (the only source) was not up to date. In the case of Social Sciences demand outstripped supply and as implied by the then Dean of the Faculty of Humanities and Education, Mr. VS, the classrooms were not in use during the summer months. The Deputy Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences recognized that while funding from the government was late in coming, there was in fact an available market for courses offered by his Faculty, a potential source of income. Social Sciences led the way and when the benefits to that Faculty were recognized by the other Faculties they followed. One example of this with respect to the Faculty of Humanities and Education was the fact that by the fifth year of the programme, in 2003, students from foreign universities were admitted into the programme. These students were able to transfer credits gained to their home programmes. The foreign student market was identified by the Deputy Dean in the Faculty of Social Sciences from the onset of that Faculty’s programme. Although the Senior Administrative Assistant in the Faculty of Science and Agriculture admitted that that Faculty’s summer programme was “no way as successful economically as Social Sciences”, the development of the three summer programmes was an indication that entrepreneurial action, structures and attitude had taken root in at least three of the five faculties at the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine.

As far as the Continuing Engineering Education Centre is concerned Prof. CI in response to interview question 1 “Why did the programme start?” informed that he had done his Master’s degree in the late seventies at Brunel University of West London in the United Kingdom which was a strong industrially linked university. He further advised that in his view it was one of the foremost universities in Britain involved in outreach programmes, continuing education and distance

education “and so I became very much enthused about that thing”. Based on his knowledge of the Brunel experience he was of the view that five or six courses per year was insufficient and was firm in his belief that much more was possible. With that belief, together with the theory and concept of modeling, whether or not he was aware of the existence of such a theory, the Centre leaped forward after he was appointed its leader in 1986. In Trinidad and Tobago “we were really leaders and the pioneers in this thing particularly in a big way in continuing education, continuing engineering education particularly”. The Centre, therefore, was in fact the first driving force in the building of entrepreneurialism at the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine Campus.

The Health Economics Unit, on the other hand, came into existence without the benefit of anything similar to it. The Co-ordinator termed it an “invention” since there was nothing like it before in Trinidad and Tobago or in the region. A need in the region was identified and Prof. KT took on the challenge to satisfy that need. As in the case of the Faculty of Social Sciences Summer programme, the concept of the Health Economics Unit was an innovative one. However, where the two programmes part ways is that while the Deputy Dean, Dr. PK saw a business opportunity and exploited it, the concept of the Health Economics Unit was not to exploit an emerging market for financial gain but to provide assistance to the countries in the region who needed help with their health sector reform programmes. Prof. KT’s insistence that money followed good service and not the other way around, which was corroborated by Shattock (2003) who also held a similar view that financial success followed academic success, was the hallmark of the unit’s success. The unit was never in a position to provide financial assistance to the Department of Economics but it was able to sustain itself without financial assistance from the University of the West Indies.

The reasons for the birth and early years of each programme were therefore similar in some respects and dissimilar in others but the concluding factor is that they all displayed the entrepreneurial characteristics of self-sustenance, profit orientation, ability to satisfy several objectives at the same time and the ability to provide a business-like response in dynamic situations. In addition, the Continuing Engineering Education Centre and the Faculty of Social Sciences

Summer Programme were innovative and the other two summer programmes used the latter model as a starting point for their programme.

BARRIERS AND/OR CHALLENGES

Human Resource

The then Dean of the Faculty of Humanities and Education, Mr. VS was adamant that since his Faculty's Summer Programme followed the Social Sciences programme, his Faculty was able to anticipate problems in spite of his admittance that the programme was cumbersome to run in the early years. The first challenge that the Faculty had to deal with was the insistence that the programme, when it finally started should not be called "Summer Programme". That programme was therefore called the Mid-Year Programme until the University Administration decreed that the term "Summer Programme" should be used for all programmes of that nature. However, regardless of the name, academic staff members at the Faculty of Humanities and Education as well as the Faculty of Science and Agriculture were not supportive of the programme before its inception. Increased teaching loads were not welcomed and the fact that the main criteria for promotion was a commendable research record gave staff members a legitimate reason for insisting that the summer months were needed to write research papers in order for them to fulfill that requirement. A similar sentiment was expressed by staff at the Faculty of Engineering who warned Prof. CI that the university would not promote him on the basis of the amount of effort and work that he was putting into the running of the Centre. Another aspect of human resource challenges was the inability of the Faculty of Science Agriculture to recruit part time lecturers to help with the teaching of the summer courses. The Senior Administrative Assistant in the Faculty of Science and Agriculture informed that while the Faculty of Social Sciences was able to recruit part time lecturers to assist in summer teaching, the supply of Science teachers was not in abundance as the Social Sciences related personnel. The Faculty of Humanities and Education overcame that problem by the willingness of part time and post graduate students who in the then Dean's words, "carried the programme in its early years". The question of compensation for staff who participated in the programme also posed a challenge. While the Deputy Dean and the abrasive Administrative Assistant

dealt with that problem in a systematic way at the Faculty of Social Sciences, Mr. VS lamented that some senior academics at the Faculty of Humanities and Education continued to refuse to be a part of the programme citing that even though part-timers did the actual teaching, the compensation was inadequate for the time consuming task of monitoring and the carrying out of examination responsibilities. At the Faculty of Science and Agriculture, the Senior Administrative Assistant described some staff members that took part in the Summer Programme as mercenaries since all tasks were itemized in the calculation of payment for work undertaken which was not the case during Semesters 1 and 2. With respect to the Continuing Engineering Education Centre, since the one and two day courses were run during the teaching year, the staff faced the challenge of being compensated for additional duties. The battles between the Administration and Faculty personnel as documented in the findings in that particular case even caused the cancellation of courses in 1981 when staff members refused to perform the additional teaching without proper compensation. On the other hand, at the Health Economics Unit, the problem associated with compensation was quite different. Staff were recruited and compensated based on available projects and so the issue of staff retention and not compensation posed a challenge for that Unit. Additionally, the Health Economic Unit was the only programme in which there was evidence of the need to relieve staff members of their jobs.

Alternative Source of Income

As stated earlier the culture at the traditional University of the West Indies was not one which encouraged “money making” of any kind. Evidence of this was seen in the findings of the Science and Agriculture case in which the Bursary expressed concern about the level of fees that students were charged for participating in the Long Vacation Programme in the then Faculty of Agriculture. A lower fee was recommended which would have resulted in a surplus of less than one thousand dollars as opposed to the four thousand plus figure that was realized. During the late eighties the University did not enjoy good financial health as pointed out in the findings. Income was sorely needed so that although there were barriers to the setting up and expansion of business units, the University reaped the benefits of the profits that were gained from each

entrepreneurial unit which was more than welcome at that time. Surplus funds generated from the programmes, with the exception of the Health Economics Unit were used in a similar fashion among all the Faculties involved. At the Faculty of Social Sciences surpluses were used for staff development including non academic staff, for the recurrent expenditure of the Social Sciences Computer Lab and the total expenses incurred in the hosting of the annual Evening of Excellence (students prize-giving function) and the annual Christmas party to which all levels of staff and guests were invited. In the Faculty of Humanities and Education, equipment, in particular computers were bought because of the limited budget which was allocated for that type of equipment, extra funds in addition to the allocated budget for Study and Travel Grant, were provided for staff members to attend international conferences and the funding of additional part-time staff for the regular semesters were some of the uses that were made of the surplus funds. At the Faculty of Science and Agriculture, the Senior Administrative Assistant reported that surplus funds from that programme were used to fund major renovation of buildings in the Faculty, to fund staff members including non academic staff who needed additional income to attend regional and international conferences, to fund the annual open days, to fund the annual prize giving function and other smaller initiatives within the Faculty. The Faculty of Engineering also benefited from the surplus funds generated by the Continuing Engineering Education Centre in the form of funding of the renovation to plant and equipment and additional funding to staff as well to attend international conferences. Therefore, although there were barriers and challenges associated with each programme, they all eventually became the entrepreneurial arm of each of the named Faculties.

University Administration

The statement which was made by Prof. KT, Co-ordinator of the Health Economic Unit that if people at the UWI wanted to block you they could and deemed his not being blocked as a stroke of luck proved to be a very telling statement indeed. The Continuing Engineering Education Centre endured the full brunt of administrative bureaucracy as evident in the findings. On several occasions information concerning the operations of the Centre which had been provided was requested over and over again. The administration repeatedly requested information on the

composition of the management committee, the frequency of meetings, the rate of fees charged, the procedure for the disbursement of funds and the number of courses mounted each year. In addition to the repeated requests for information, there were accusations, one of which was that the Committee was holding a separate bank account. Although all requested information was provided on each occasion and all accusations were refuted, the continuous scrutiny suggested mistrust by the University administration of the activities of the Centre. In addition to the continuous requests for information, an additional bureaucratic structure was imposed on the Centre when the University decided to appoint an overseeing committee, the Continuing Education Campus Central Committee. In the case of the Faculty of Social Sciences, after the proposal for the programme was presented, repeated requests for additional information were made but on each occasion the Deputy Dean rose to the task and provided it. As it turned out the insistence of no extra cost to the University encouraged each programme to embrace the entrepreneurial culture from its inception. The Faculty of Science and Agriculture was not spared. The Senior Administrative Assistant lamented the way in which the programme was initially treated by the University administration. “No man’s land” was the term she used to describe the programme as far as the administration was concerned. She complained that work pertaining to the programme was deemed to be unofficial extra work and as such vital information pertaining to students were not placed on their files. In the case of the Faculty of Humanities and Education, Mr. VS was firm in his belief that the Faculty of Social Sciences paved the way for his faculty so that his Faculty did not endure the administrative challenges experienced by the other Faculties. The gratefulness expressed by Prof. KT of not being supported financially but not being blocked could be appreciated when compared with the challenges experienced by the other programmes.

Bursary

The findings with respect to the relationship between the Bursary and the Deputy Dean in the Faculty of Social Sciences, Dr. PK did not unearth any evidence to suggest anything but a cordial relationship between the parties. When the university administration decided on how the income from the summer programme should be allocated, the Bursary carried out written instructions from

the Deputy Dean for the disbursement and allocation of funds. The Faculty of Humanities and Education probably enjoyed a similar cordial relationship since no mention was made of any problems between the two parties. With respect to Faculty of Science and Agriculture, the Senior Administrative Assistant did make mention of the fact that the Bursary's accounting of the summer programme was always flawed. In response to interview question 2 which dealt with preceding the birth and early years of the programme, she informed that the Faculty could not get the Bursary to provide proper accounting records with respect to fees paid by students for the summer programme: "we would have to go with our accounts, we would keep an excel file and go with our accounts to trade off with their accounts for them to find money". However, the relationship between the Bursary and the Continuing Engineering Education Centre and the relationship between the Bursary and Health Economics Unit were at two extremes. The findings showed that while the relationship between the Bursary and the former was anything but cordial, the relationship with the latter was one in which the Bursary went beyond the call to facilitate that Unit. The desperate statement made by Prof. CI that the Centre's money seemed to go into a hole and he was unable to get it out was the culmination of the frustration he had to deal with in trying to run a business operation in a traditional climate, where certain types of payments were made every two weeks regardless of the circumstances. There was a definite disconnect between the urgency required in a business setting and the slow, bureaucratic manner in which the operations in the Bursary were carried out. On the other hand, with respect to the Health Economics Unit, the Co-ordinator praised the past and present Bursars for facilitating his unit. While the Bursary was not anxious to pay bills from income they had received in the Centre's case, they used reserve money to pay the bills incurred by the Health Economics Unit on many occasions, with the promise from the Unit that the money would be repaid on the receipt of outstanding income.

Student/Client Matters

The fact that students (in the case of the Summer Programmes) and clients (in the case of the Continuing Engineering Education Centre) were paying for a product and service certainly qualified them to be consumers of higher education and as such they were more than aware of their rights and entitlements. Since it was

virtually impossible to complete a first degree at the University of the West Indies in less than three years before the birth of the Summer Programmes, regulations governing time frame and requirement for the granting of degrees were compatible with each other. However, after the birth of the Summer Programmes a loophole with respect to the two regulations was identified. Therefore, although the Faculty initially enforced the timeframe regulations they had no choice but to allow students who had completed their degrees in less than three years to graduate because of the requirement regulation which stated that students will graduate when he/she satisfied the course requirement for their respective degrees. At the Faculty of Social Sciences, it became almost impossible not to admit a student who had completed nine of the ten established level one courses during the summer into the university at level two. To not do so would have certainly sent the wrong signals to prospective summer school students in the competitive environment in which universities now find themselves. An example of the competitiveness of the environment was seen in the findings in the case of the Continuing Engineering Education Centre. When the Centre was the only organization that was offering continuing engineering courses, clients were more concerned about the course content as opposed to facilities and services during the duration of their course. However, with other providers in the market, who were offering courses on hotel premises with enhanced facilities, classrooms in the Faculty of Engineering were no longer appreciated by the course clientele. Of course, this is all in keeping with the view espoused by Rinne and Koivula (2005, p. 99)) who concluded that universities cannot escape marketisation.

The barriers, challenges and inhibitions that the five programmes encountered are similar to what traditional higher education institutions have encountered worldwide as discussed and explained by Davies (1987) and Shattock (2003) and itemized by Lambert (2006). While the barriers, challenges and inhibitions vary among the five cases, the underlying factors that caused them to be encountered at the University of the West Indies were the same: the culture of the organization which did not support the action that was required for successful entrepreneurial activity e.g. fast businesslike responses, and the lack of structure to support entrepreneurial activity. However, culture and structure gradually changed due in

part to persistence from Prof CI and Dr. PK. By the time the Health Economics Unit came into being, a different kind of culture was beginning to emerge.

POLICY

Summer School Regulations

Based on the findings in all the case studies, a review of existing policy and the formulation of new policy proved to be inevitable. In the Faculty of Social Sciences, the Deputy Dean sought and gained the University's permission to temporarily use the existing examination regulations for regular students so that students enrolled in the summer programme could appeal examinations results. Specific summer school university regulations were eventually formulated and implemented. At the Faculty of Science and Agriculture the Senior Administrative Assistant admitted that in formulating regulations with respect to that Faculty's Summer Programme, the regulations formulated by the Faculty of Social Sciences were first looked at and those that were applicable were implemented. In other words they built on what had been formulated by the forerunner, Social Sciences. The point made by the Senior Administrative Assistant that the implementation of the Summer School forced the Faculty of Science and Agriculture to re-look and modify existing regulations to suit the new circumstance is another case in point of the relationship between the entrepreneurial summer school units and review and formulation of policy. The case of the student who did not possess any Advanced Level subjects but who had completed nine of the ten Level one courses and subsequently sought entry into the University awakened the University administration's eyes to what was possible as a result of the Summer Schools. Although they did not wish to treat with that new situation and initially ruled that Advanced Level passes was the route to admittance, they eventually relented and regulations were eventually formulated to facilitate students like her. Although there was initial disagreement by the University's Academic Committee in 1994, as recorded in the findings of the Social Sciences case study, over the extent to which Summer Schools should be approved as institutionally integrated into the regular University operations, general regulations governing Summer Schools on all campuses were approved and implemented three years later in May, 1997.

Allocation of Surplus Funds

Who owned surplus funds and how they should be used was a contentious issue as soon as such funds came into being. The Deputy Dean in the Faculty of Social Sciences, Dr. PK insisted very early that after all relevant expenses had been paid, the surplus funds belonged to the Faculty. He reminded all concerned parties that if he chose to shut down the programme the university administration could do nothing about it. By 1995 Guidelines for Fees and Incomes for Summer Courses/Programmes were formulated and implemented throughout the whole university. Therefore subsequent programmes like the Faculty of Science and Agriculture and the Faculty of Humanities and Education Summer Programmes were spared the hassle endured by the Faculty of Social Sciences as to how and by whom surplus funds should be allocated. At the Continuing Engineering Education Centre there was a virtual battle between the Centre and the University administration over the allocation and use of surplus funds. The findings showed that in 1981 courses were cancelled when lecturers refused to be a part of the programme because of the non-payment issue. However, after several proposals and counterproposals agreement was finally reached and policy formulated and implemented with respect to surplus funds in that programme. As far as the Health Economics Unit was concerned, the question of surplus funds was never an issue since income generated from that unit's activities was used to simply sustain it.

Policy formulation specific to the Health Economics Unit

While summer school regulations and the allocation of surplus funds pertained specifically to the Summer Programmes and the Centre for Continuing Engineering Education Committee, there were some specific policy changes and the implementation of new policy that became necessary because of the existence of the Unit. As outlined in the findings of the Health Economics Unit case, the first three were the waving of the common services fee, the setting up of special project accounts in the Bursary and the eventual recognition by the Inter-American Development Bank that the Unit was the preferred agency as far as health economics policy in the region was concerned. The now accepted policy that the Unit is the preferred agency in the Caribbean for the internship of young graduates with an interest in health economics is another example of the relationship between policy formulation and entrepreneurial units.

Policy and the Bursary

The Bursary, as well also played a part in the formulation of policy as a result of the existence of the five programmes. Before the advent of the entrepreneurial units, the funding came from either the Government or sponsors of endowed Chairs and all belonged to the University in general. It therefore became necessary for bursary officials to implement a policy of colour coded registration forms which helped them to identify the programme the student or client was involved in so that the correct allocation of income could be recorded. That system eventually eliminated the problem identified by the Senior Administrative Assistant who identified the need for the Faculty to keep its own financial records on an excel spread sheet, which was used to compare financial data, in its efforts to ensure that income was correctly allocated to its programme account

Based on the above, the five case studies provide evidence of the relationship between entrepreneurial units and policy formulation. The movement from traditional to entrepreneurial brings with it the need to revisit and reformulate policy and to formulate new policy to suit the new situation. There is, therefore, a direct relationship between transformation and policy formulation. Existing literature have recognized this relationship. Rinne and Koivula (2005, p. 103) espoused that “general social change, modification of higher education policy and the management culture.....have introduced new views in higher education policy”.

LEADERSHIP

The findings from the five case studies suggest that strong leadership contributed to the success of three of the cases, the Faculty of Social Sciences Summer Programme, the Centre for Continuing Engineering Education Centre's Programme and the Health Economics Unit initiative. The other two programmes, the Faculty of Humanities and Education Summer Programme and the Faculty of Science and Agriculture Summer Programme seemed to have been successfully managed with the help of what was accomplished because of the leadership of the Social Sciences Summer Programme.

The immediate response by the Deputy Dean in the Faculty of Social Sciences, Dr. PK to interview question 5 “I don’t let anybody intimidate me” gives an idea of his boldness and strength of character. As recorded in the findings of the Social Sciences case challenges and barriers abounded but on each occasion that they were presented, he provided solutions if they were justified and stuck to his beliefs if he felt they were not justified. His ability to see what was possible came to the fore when in light of criticism of the use of the word “summer” his response was that he was using the language of the market to reach his intended clientele. Not only was he able to successfully capture that market but the findings in the Humanities and Education case provided evidence that that Faculty’s programme reaped the benefits of the overseas university student clientele, although it was the senior academics in that Faculty who had mocked the idea of the term “summer”. Dr. PK’s ability to avert student related problems was emphasized when he implored the Campus Principal and Academic Board to use existing regulations in light of the fact that in his haste to start the Summer Programme, he had overlooked the need for regulations with respect to appeal of summer programme examination results. One significant victory that he achieved was the eventual guidelines with respect to income and expenditure of summer programme funds. He had insisted that surplus funds, after all mandatory expenses had been paid, belonged to the Faculty. Although the university administration abhorred the concept of profit making as was evident in the Long Vacation Programme in the Faculty of Agriculture in 1989, by 1995 when they were forced to provide guidelines with respect to monies generated by sources other than government subvention, the university administration’s instructed that cost recovery and revenue generation should be the underlying principles in the pricing of courses and programmes. The business acumen exhibited by Dr. PK which was initially rejected by the university administration was embraced within three years of the birth of the summer programme.

As far as leadership with respect to the Humanities and Education Summer Programme and the Science and Agriculture Summer Programme was concerned, the then Dean, Mr. VS, as the findings showed credited the Social Sciences programme directly and indirectly the astute leadership of that programme for the success and eventual financial gain that his faculty enjoyed. He admitted that

while the Social Sciences programme operated as a unit from inception, the programme in his faculty was an adjunct of the Dean's office in which the management of the programme was carried out by the existing Administrative Assistant. The Senior Administrative Assistant in the Faculty of Science and Agriculture, who managed her Faculty's programme indicated that much more was possible with respect to income generation in her faculty but what was needed was somebody to direct and lead the programme.

The leadership provided by Prof. CI with respect to the Continuing Engineering Education Centre as documented in the findings is similar to what was provided by Dr. PK in the Faculty of Social Sciences Summer Programme. Despite the culture of the organization, Prof. CI was able to take an existing programme and turn it into a successful entrepreneurial unit. He displayed his strong leadership qualities even before he was entrusted with the chairmanship of the then Committee, as was evident in his role in the mounting of the Metal Working seminar which realized a healthy surplus. It should be noted that his request to mount the seminar was during the time when there was uncertainty regarding short courses in the Faculty because of additional bureaucratic rules and regulations which were imposed by the University Administration at that time. Like Dr. PK, he was simply unafraid to challenge the bureaucratic system under which the University operated. He even went a step further in breaking rules in order to provide the effective business service that was required at that time. He embraced the title of dictator and was not concerned about his own personal situation with respect to the University's appraisal system, which rewarded research as opposed to the successful leadership and management of entrepreneurial units. The challenges he faced in his interaction with bursary officials seemed to spur him on and in negotiations with the Bursary with respect to the management of the Centre, a deal was arrived at in which the Bursary was provided with computer equipment which was purchased from funds generated by the Centre. The two men, Dr. PK and Prof. CI displayed similar personalities. While Dr. PK did not allow anybody to intimidate him, Prof. CI's quote that "they can't lock me up" emphasized the similarities between the two men.

On the other hand, Prof. KT, Leader and Co-ordinator of the Health Economics Unit literally negotiated his way to success. However, like Prof. CI and Dr. PK, his persistence, decisiveness and sheer passion for his work ensured the success of his undertakings. The prolonged and continuous discussions that he had with the then Bursar which resulted in the reduction of the common services fee served as the benchmark or in the language of traditional universities as “precedent” for subsequent bursary related decisions. As in all business undertaking, decisive action is sometimes necessary in order to keep the organization on course and Prof. KT moved with haste in order to protect his Unit when he relieved the ‘poisonous’ employee of her job. Additionally, so convinced was he that his Unit was providing a necessary service that he recommended the Health Economics Unit model as the one the University should adopt and follow.

However, although the findings and the above discussion contend that leadership was an important factor in the conceptualization, implementation and sustainability of the Faculty of Social Sciences Summer Programme, the Continuing Engineering Education Centre and the Health Economics Unit, effective management also played a part in the success of each programme. The other two cases, the Humanities and Education and Science and Agriculture Summer Programmes benefited from the strong leadership but the findings also showed that the managers of the two programmes also displayed some leadership skills as shown in Mr. VS’s and the Senior Administrative Assistant’s problem solving abilities. Toor and Ofori (2008) in examining how and why leadership and management were different posited that “in order to be competitive future organizations need to develop as many leaders as possible but these leaders should also have sufficient management knowledge and capabilities; organizations also need effective managers who possess adequate leadership skills for better problem solving and overall functions in teams” (p. 61). Based on that view, the University of the West Indies ultimately benefited from the combination of leadership and management skills displayed by the leaders and managers of the five programmes. This, therefore, corroborate the view expressed by Kotter (1990) that leadership and management together can make an effective organization.

CHAPTER 10

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In reviewing the literature on the entrepreneurial university, what stood out was the fact that in order for higher education institutions to survive in the twenty-first century, it is imperative that their mode of operation and structure should change. While some contributors to the debate prefer other nomenclatures such as the enterprise university or the innovative university, evidence was presented to show that although Clark's (1998) view and model has been criticized, the general feeling is that going the entrepreneurial route is inevitable. However, how a traditional university goes about transforming itself into becoming entrepreneurial remains unclear in the existing literature.

The aim of this thesis was twofold. The first and main aim was to challenge Clark's (1998) assumption that entrepreneurialism could not be driven by minor enclaves. Wasser's (2001) criticism that the title of Clark's (1998) book "Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways of Transformation" led one to believe that the book would provide a recipe for the transformation of traditional universities informed my second aim. This second aim was to not only contribute to the literature on the entrepreneurial university, but to put forward a 'recipe', using the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine's experience, as exemplified in five selected cases, for transforming existing traditional universities into entrepreneurial organizations.

Based on the evidence unearthed and presented, each of the five cases that were investigated turned out to be successful entrepreneurial units which impacted on the culture and structure of the organization. *The studies have revealed that entrepreneurial action, structures and attitude permeated the highly bureaucratic, traditional organization, albeit over an extended period of time. In other words, the organization has been transforming itself without a clear policy and administrative directive from the University's top management to do so.* There was therefore no operational plan for the transformation of the University. Chapter 9, by its very nature, has provided a summary of some of the similarities and differences of how each enclave was born, the barriers, obstacles and

challenges encountered by each enclave, the changes and implementation of new policy as a result of each enclave and the leadership and/or management of each enclave. While two of them, the Faculty of Humanities and Education Summer Programme and the Faculty of Science and Agriculture Summer Programme used the Faculty of Social Sciences Summer Programme as a benchmark in some areas, the other three enclaves, the Continuing Engineering Education Centre, the Faculty of Social Sciences Summer Programme and the Health Economics Unit were all pioneers in their particular areas on the St. Augustine Campus of the University of the West Indies. Ultimately, they all played a part in contributing to the transformation that has been taking place at the University. However, the main finding of this study is that not only are entrepreneurial enclaves possible, but that it was the accumulation of the various ad hoc responses from units rather than any deliberate policy that made the University entrepreneurial.

The Strategic Plan of the University of the West Indies for the period 2007-2012 outlined as its core strategic focus the following: Teaching and Learning, Graduate Studies, Research and Innovation and Service to the UWI-12 countries (formerly called non-campus countries) and Other Underserved Communities. As well, the plan identifies three major enablers, namely, Transforming the Leadership, Managerial and Administrative Culture and Processes; Marketing and Branding; and Funding the Enterprise. It can be argued that these major enablers could be seen as arising, to a greater or lesser degree, from the experience of the 'enclaves' and the adjustments made to accommodate them. Under the heading "Funding the Enterprise" the plan states:

The mobilization of adequate funding to pursue the developmental path set out in this plan is essential to the successful transformation and positioning of UWI to continue to contribute to national and regional growth, development and competitiveness in a 21st century context (UWI Strategic Plan 2007-2012, p. 39)

Obviously then, the goals and objectives set out in the plan can only be achieved if adequate funding is realized. The plan has identified a mix of strategies to be implemented to broaden the funding base. These are:

- further growth in earned income facilitated by restructuring and strengthening of the Business Development Offices (on each campus)
- formation of a University Consultancy Company
- planned alumni giving and establishment of a UWI Endowment Fund
- cost recovery through tuition fees, accompanied by appropriately designed student financing support schemes
- leveraging of real property and other assets to facilitate access to private sector funding sources
- development of finance from regional and international agencies

In light of the above, I wish to recommend that further entrepreneurial transformation can be achieved at the University of the West Indies with the appointment of an entrepreneurial transformation team/unit consisting of among others, Prof. CI, Dr. PK and Prof KT to lead and manage the following activities:

- Sensitize all categories of staff of the need to continue the entrepreneurial transformation process by showing them what has been achieved so far from minor enclaves and pointing out what could be achieved
- Oversee the production of documentaries of the five case studies (which can be shown at sensitization sessions)
- Engage in discussions with Academic and Professional Staff (since the appraisal system puts a heavy weighting on research output for this category of staff) to come up with an acceptable appraisal system that would be more in line with the entrepreneurial transformation thrust.
- Work closely with the Marketing and Communication Department to ensure that the University community, its stakeholders and the general Caribbean Community are aware of the strides that the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine has made and

continues to make with respect to the entrepreneurial transformation.

With respect to my second aim, the entrepreneurial university literature has not only been extended with the information and discussion that has been presented in this thesis, but the potential of enclaves of entrepreneurship can almost be seen as a recipe for the transformation of traditional universities into entrepreneurial organizations. The findings of the case studies have shown that the entrepreneurial spirit and culture eased its way into the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine mainly because of the foresight of Prof. CI, Dr. PK and Prof. KT. The impact of one enclave was tremendous and the impact of several enclaves was even more tremendous.

Finally, one expectation of a Doctorate in Business Administration – Higher Education Management (DBA-HEM) thesis is that it should contain some recommendations with respect to the enhancement of the management of higher education institutions. I, therefore, wish to proffer some evidence based policy advice to managers and administrators of higher education institutions who intend to embark on the entrepreneurial route:

- (1) New hire policy – Managers with leadership skills and leaders with management skills should be hired. The evidence of the successful role of leader/manager displayed by Prof. CI and Dr. PK attest to this recommendation.
- (2) It is possible for universities to balance teaching and research with entrepreneurial activity. Actually they should be combined for the benefit of all stakeholders as seen in Health Economics Unit (HEU) case study. A weighting system should be formulated together with a negotiated compensation package so that employees could be compensated based on their contribution to the entrepreneurial unit.

- (3) Involve staff at all levels in coming up with strategic plans. This approach helps with the “buy-in” process. The chances of employees living and breathing the mission and core values of the organizations would be far greater if they are involved in the process. This process was adopted for the third strategic plan at the University of the West Indies.
- (4) Revisit existing policy before formulating new ones i.e. build on what has been created or changed by other entrepreneurial units at your university so that reinvention could be kept at its minimum. This approach proved to be successful for the Faculty of Science and Agriculture Summer Programme.
- (5) Do it right the first time around and continue to do so. As was seen in the HEU case where the IDB slowly but surely came around to the view that the HEU was the first port of call.
- (6) Last but by no means least, the governance structure, especially in the areas of financial policy and personnel policy, must support entrepreneurial activity. This will certainly help in minimizing the number of barriers and obstacles that were identified in the five case studies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ackroyd, S. (1996). Organization Contra Organizations: Professions and Organizational Change in the United Kingdom. *Organization Studies*, 17, pp. 599-621.
- Armbruster, C.L. (2008). Research Universities: Autonomy and Self-Reliance After the Entrepreneurial University. *Policy Futures in Education*, 6, 4.
- Ball, C. (2004). Managing Success and Leadership, *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, 8, 1, pp. 2-4.
- Benneworth, P. (2007). Seven Samurai Opening Up the Ivory Tower? The Construction of Newcastle as an Entrepreneurial University. *European Planning Studies*, 15, 4, pp. 487-509.
- Bernasconi, A. (2005). University Entrepreneurship in a Developing Country: The case of the Pontificia Universidad Catolica de Chile, 1985-2000. *Higher Education*, 50, 2, pp. 247-274.
- Borkowski, N. Gordon, J (2006). Entrepreneurial Organizations: The Driving Force for Improving Quality in the Healthcare Industry. *Journal of Health and Human Services Administration*, 28, 4, pp. 531-549.
- Boyer, E.L. (1987). American Higher Education: The Tide and the Undertow. *International Journal of Institutional Management in Higher Education*, 11, 1. pp. 5-11.
- Brinkmann, S. & Kvale, S. (2005). Confronting the Ethics of Qualitative Research. *Journal of Constructivist Psychology*, 18, pp. 157-181.
- Burke Johnson, R. (1997). Examining the Validity Structure of Qualitative Research. *Education*, 118, 2, pp. 282-292.
- Cangemi, J.P. (1975). Leadership Characteristics of Business Executives Appropriate for Leaders in Higher Education. *Education*, 95, 3, pp. 229-232.
- Chambers, J.B. (1999). The American University in Bulgaria as an Entrepreneurial University. *Higher Education in Europe*, 24, 1, pp. 101-108.
- Chrisman, J., Hynes, T. & Fraser, S. (1995). Faculty Entrepreneurship and Economic Development: The Case of the University of Calgary. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 10, pp. 267-281.
- Clark, B. (1998). *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways of Transformation*. Oxford: International Association of Universities and Elsevier Science Limited.

- Clark, B (2004). Delineating the Character of the Entrepreneurial University. *Higher Education Policy*, 17, 4, pp. 355-370.
- Creswell, J.W. (1998). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among Five Traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J.W. & Miller, D.L. (2000). Determining Validity in Qualitative Inquiry. *Inquiry and Practice*, 39, 3, pp. 122-130.
- Davies, J.L. (1987). The Entrepreneurial and Adaptive University – Report on the Second US Study Visit. *International Journal of Institutional Management in Higher Education*, 11, 1. pp. 12-104
- Davies, J, Hides, M .T. & Casey, S. (2001). Leadership in Higher Education. *Total Quality Management*, 12, 7 & 8, pp. 1025-1030.
- Davies, J.L. & Morgan, A.W. (1981). The Politics of Institutional Change. In L.Wagner (ed), *Agenda for Institutional Change in Higher Education*. London: SHRE & NFER-Nelson.
- Deem, R. (2001). Globalisation, New Managerialism, Academic Capitalism and Entrepreneurialism in Universities: Is the Local Dimension still Important? *Comparative Education*, 37, 1, pp. 7-20.
- Di Maggio, P. & Powell, W. (1983). The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48, 2, pp. 147-160.
- Dill, D. (1995). University-industry Entrepreneurship: the Organization and Management of American University Technology Transfer Units. *Higher Education*, 29, pp. 369-384.
- Edwards, B. (2002). Deep Insider Research. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 2, 1, pp. 71-84.
- Etzkowitz, H. (1983). Entrepreneurial Scientists and Entrepreneurial Universities in American Academic Science. *Minerva*, 21, 2-3 pp.193-223.
- Etzkowitz, H. (2003). Research Groups as ‘quasi firms’: The Invention of the Entrepreneurial University. *Research Policy*, 32, pp.109-121.
- Etzkowitz, H., Webster, A., Gebhardt, C. & Castisano Terra, B.R. (2000). The future of the university and the University of the Future: evolution of ivory tower to entrepreneurial paradigm. *Research Policy*, 29, pp. 313-330.
- Finlay, I. (2004). Living in an ‘Entrepreneurial’ University. *Research in Post-Compulsory Education*, 9, 3, pp. 417-434.
- Giblin, M. (2006). Structural elaboration and institutional isomorphism: the case of crime analysis units. *Policing*, 29, 4, pp. 643-664.

- Guerrero-Cano, M., Kirby, D. & Urbano, D. (2006). A Literature Review on Entrepreneurial Universities: An Institutional Approach. Working Paper presented at the 3rd Conference of Pre-communications to congresses. Business Economic Department, Autonomous University of Barcelona, Barcelona.
- Jacob, M., Lundqvist, M. & Hellmark, H. (2003). Entrepreneurial Transformation in the Swedish University System: The Case of Chalmers university of Technology. *Research Policy*, 32, 9, pp. 1555-1569
- Khaleelee, O. & Woolf, R. (1996). Personality, Life Experience and Leadership Capability. *Leadership and Organisation Development Journal*, 17, pp. 5-11.
- Kirby, D.A. (2002a). *Entrepreneurship*. Maidenhead: Mc Graw Hill.
- Kirby, D.A (2003). *Entrepreneurship*. Maidenhead: Mc Graw Hill Education.
- Kirk, J. & Miller, M.L. (1986). *Reliability and Validity in Qualitative Research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Kotter, J. P. (1990). *A Force for Change: How Leadership Differs from Management*, New York: The Free Press.
- Kristensen, B. (1999). The Entrepreneurial University as a Learning University. *Higher Education in Europe*, 24, 1, pp. 35-46.
- Kwong, P. (1997). Manufacturing Ethnicity. *Critique of Anthropology*, 17, pp. 365-387.
- Lambert, B. H. (2006). Impediments, Inhibitors and Barriers to University Entrepreneurialism. *European Universities for Entrepreneurship: their role in the Europe of Knowledge (EUEREK Project)*
- Lazzeroni, M. & Piccaluga, A. (2003). Towards the Entrepreneurial University. *Local Economy*, 18, 1, pp. 38-48.
- Le Compte, M.D. & Pressle, J. (1993). *Ethnography and Qualitative Design in Educational Research*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Lincoln, Y.S. & Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Lodge, M. & Wegrich, K. (2005). Control Over Government: Institutional Isomorphism and Governance Dynamics in German Public Administration. *Policy Studies Journal*, 33, 2, pp. 213-233.
- Logan, J.R., Alba, R.D. & Zhang, W. 2002. "Immigrant Enclaves and Ethnic Communities in New York and Los Angeles" *American Sociological Review*, 67, pp.299-322.

- Marginson, S. & Considine, M. (2000). *The Enterprise University: Power, Governance and Reinvention in Australia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Maxwell, J.A. (1996). *Qualitative Research Design*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Mercer, J. (2006). The challenges of insider research in educational institutions: wielding a double-edged sword and resolving delicate dilemmas. *Oxford Review of Education*, 33:1.
- Neal, J.E. (1998). Quality Assurance in the Entrepreneurial University. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 1998, 99, pp. 69-85.
- Parker, P. (2001). Local-Global Partnerships for High-Tech Development: Integrating Top-Down and Bottom-Up Models. *Economic Development Quarterly*, 15: pp. 149-167.
- Pawlowski, K. (2001). Towards the Entrepreneurial University. *Higher Education in Europe*, 26, 3, pp. 427-436.
- Petruzzellis, L., D'Uggento, A.M. & Romanazzi, S. (2006). Student Satisfaction and Quality of Service in Italian Universities. *Managing Service Quality*, 16, pp. 349-364.
- Portes, A. & Zhou, M. (1993). The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and its Variants. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 530, pp. 74-96.
- Punch, K. F. (2005). *Introduction to Social Research: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*, 2nd ed. London: Sage.
- Report of the Chancellor's Commission on the Governance of UWI, July 1994.
- Rinne, R. & Koivula, J. (2005). The Changing place of the University and a Clash of the Values: The Entrepreneurial University in the European Knowledge Society – A Review of the Literature. *Higher Education Management & Policy*, 17, 3, pp. 91-123.
- Robbins, S. (1993). *Organisational Behaviour*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Robertson, D. (2000). Students as consumers: The individualization of competitive advantage. In Scott, P. (Ed.). *Higher Education Re-formed*, pp. 78-94 London: Falmer Press.
- Ropke, J. (1998). The Entrepreneurial University, Innovation, Academic Knowledge Creation and Regional Development in a Globalized Economy. Working Paper Department of Economics, Phillips-Universität Marburg, Germany: 15.

- Schulte, P. (2004). The Entrepreneurial University: a strategy for institutional development. *Higher Education in Europe*, 29, 2, pp. 187-191.
- Shattock, M. (2003). *Managing Successful Universities*. Berkshire, UK: Open University Press.
- Shattock, M. (2005). European Universities for Entrepreneurship: Their Role in the Europe of Knowledge – The Theoretical Context. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 17, 3, pp. 13-25.
- Sharma, R. (2004). Performance-based funding in the entrepreneurial North American and Australian Universities. *Journal of Higher Education Policy & Management*, 26, 1, pp. 109-118.
- Sikes, P. & Potts, A. (2008). *Researching Education from the inside: Investigations from within*. UK: Routledge.
- Silverman, R.M. (1999). Black Business, Group Resources and the Economic Detour: Contemporary Black Manufacturers in Chicago's Ethnic Beauty Aids Industry. *Journal of Black Studies*, 30 pp. 232-258.
- Smith, J.K. (1984). The Problem of Criteria for Judging Interpretive Inquiry. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 6, 379-391.
- Smith, D. (1999). Book Review: Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways of Transformation by Burton R. Clark (1998). *Higher Education*, 38, 3, p. 373.
- Soares, V. & Amaral, A. (1999). The Entrepreneurial University: A Fine Answer to a Difficult Problem? *Higher Education in Europe*, 24, 1, pp. 11-21.
- Stake, R.E. (1994). 'Case studies' in N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln [eds], *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. pp. 236-47.
- Stankovic, F. (2006). Entrepreneurialism at the University of Novi Sad. *Higher Education in Europe*, 31, 2, pp. 117-128.
- Subotzky, G. (1999). Alternatives to the Entrepreneurial University: New Modes of Knowledge Production. *Higher Education*, 38, pp. 401-440.
- Tewarie, B. (2006). Not Business as Usual. *Trinidad Guardian*, March 24, p. 29.
- Toor, S. and Ofori, G. (2008). Leadership versus Management: How they are different and why. *Leadership & Management in Engineering*, 2, pp.61-71.
- Townsend, B.K. and Bassoppo-Moyo, S. (1997). The Effective Community College Academic Administrator: Necessary Competences and Attitudes. *Community College Review*, 25, pp. 41-56.

- Townsend, S. & Campbell, R. (2007). Homogeneity in community-based rape prevention programs: Empirical evidence of institutional isomorphism. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 35, 3, pp. 367-382.
- Tuunainen, J. (2005). Contesting a Hybrid Firm at a Traditional University. *Social Studies of Science (Sage)*, 35, 2, pp. 173-210.
- University of the West Indies. (2004). *Directory: Committees, Boards, Members of Staff. Calendar, Volume II Academic Year 2004-2005*.
- UWI 60th Anniversary: A Year Long Celebration of Caribbean Excellence. In *The Pelican: A Magazine of the University of the West Indies*, Issue 4 January-June 2008, p. 18.
- Wasser, H. (2001). Book Review: Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways of Transformation by Burton R. Clark (1998), *The European Legacy*, 6, 4, pp. 509-511.
- Weber, I. (2003). Localizing the Global: Successful Strategies for Selling Television Programmes to China. *Gazette*, 65, pp. 273-290.
- Webster, G. (2003). Knowledge and Higher Education: contestable spaces and strategic possibilities, *Excerpts presented at the 6th European Student Convention Palermo*.
- Wong, P., Ho, Y. & Singh, A. (2007). Towards an “Entrepreneurial University” Model to Support Knowledge-Based Economic Development: The Case of the National University of Singapore. *World Development*, 35, 6, pp. 941-958.
- Yin, R.K. (2003). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, 3rd Ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Yokoyama, K. (2006). Entrepreneurialism in Japanese and UK Universities: Governance, Management, Leadership, and Funding. *Higher Education*, 52, 3, pp. 523-555.
- Yusof, M. & Jain, K.K. (2007). Categories of University-level Entrepreneurship: A Literature Survey. *International Entrepreneurial Management Journal*.

APPENDIX 1

September 28, 2007

Dear

Doctorate in Business Administration – Higher Education Management (DBA-HEM)

I am a student at the University of Bath pursuing the DBA-HEM. My thesis is entitled “Entrepreneurialism Driven from Minor Enclaves at the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine”. I would like to ask for your assistance in my effort to collect data.

I am studying selected cases that may be linked to entrepreneurial activity within the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine Campus. I am interested in the role of these cases in the creation of an entrepreneurial culture. For this study, I have selected the [NAME OF FACULTY UNIT OR PROGRAMME OR CENTRE OR INSTITUTE] as one of the cases I wish to study. I am relying on documents and interviews in an effort to collect all relevant data to accurately establish the facts about the birth and early years of each of these programmes. It is expected that the study will contribute to what we know about entrepreneurialism in universities such as ours. As someone who has experienced the development of [NAME OF FACULTY UNIT OR PROGRAMME OR CENTRE OR INSTITUTE], you may have an understanding of this experience that is useful to this study.

I, therefore, wish to request an interview with you. If you agree to be interviewed, I will discuss a suitable time and venue with you. Please note that the interview will be tape-recorded and you will be given the opportunity to read the verbatim transcription. At that time you can, if you wish, correct or rephrase what you have said. I wish also to request your permission to read any relevant documents relating to the programme e.g. progress and/or evaluation reports, financial reports, recommendations, etc.

I wish to give the assurance that information shared with me in the interview will be treated confidentially. Your actual name will not be used in the written thesis.

Please sign the attached copy of this letter as an indication that you have agreed to be an interviewee.

Sincerely,

Linda Steele

APPENDIX 2

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS (Pilot Study)

1. The official records show that the purpose of the Faculty of Social Sciences Summer Programme was to enable existing students to have an opportunity to repeat failed compulsory first year courses in order to move on with their degree. What is your view?
2. Did you encounter any obstacles or resistance in achieving your goal of setting up the Summer Programme?
3. Was there a need for new policy to deal with the birth of the Summer Programme for example the application by CD for entry into the B.Sc. programme?
4. Did you at any time feel intimidated by anyone at any level of University administration?
5. Non UWI students, especially adult learners accessed the courses from the second year of the programme. What do you think accounted for the capture of that market?
6. What do you think accounted for the success of the Summer Certificate in Public Administration?
7. The Summer Programme became a successful entrepreneurial unit very early in its life. What do you think were the factors that lead to its success?
8. Any other thoughts on the Summer Programme you would like to share with me?

APPENDIX 3

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS (Larger Study)

1. Why did the programme start?
2. How did the programme start?
3. What were the obstacles preceding the birth and in the early years of the programme? How did you overcome them and did new ones arise?
4. Were there any perverse (or unexpected) outcomes for anybody? E.g. staff, students, administration etc.
5. Did you feel that you had the full support of the University Administration during the start up or early years of the programme?
6. Who were the persons who accessed the courses in the programme?
7. What have been the main successes of the programme?
8. What do you think were the factors that led to these successes?
9. Are there any other thoughts about the Programme you would like to share with me?

APPENDIX 4

RESEARCH QUESTIONS (Pilot Study)

1. Was the Summer Programme recognized as an entrepreneurial unit in its early years and was it intended to be an entrepreneurial unit?
2. Were there barriers/obstacles in the creation of an entrepreneurial unit within a traditional university?
3. What is the relationship between an entrepreneurial unit within a traditional university and policy formulation?
4. Does leadership play a role in driving entrepreneurialism from a minor enclave?

APPENDIX 5

RESEARCH QUESTIONS (Larger Study)

1. Why and how was each unit created and was each one entrepreneurial in nature from its very beginning?
2. What barriers/obstacles were encountered in the creation of each entrepreneurial unit within the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine Campus?
3. What is the relationship between the entrepreneurial units within the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine and policy formulation?
4. Did leadership play a role in driving entrepreneurialism in each unit?

APPENDIX 6

Summary of Documents Faculty of Social Sciences Summer Programme

Document 1

Extract from Meeting of Campus Board, Faculty of Social Sciences held on March 12, 1992 which dealt with the proposal for a Faculty of Social Sciences Summer Programme submitted by the Deputy Dean (Student Matters).

Document 2

Memorandum dated April 3, 1992 from Deputy Dean (Student Matters) to the University Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences outlining the budget for the proposed Summer Programme.

Document 3

Extract from Academic Board minutes of April 30, 1992 which contained the proposal from the Faculty of Social Sciences for the introduction of a Summer Programme. Academic Board approved the proposal for a Summer Programme in the Faculty of Social Sciences as a pilot project subject to certain terms and conditions.

Document 4

Memorandum dated May 1, 1992 from Deputy Dean (Student Affairs), Faculty of Social Sciences to the Pro Vice Chancellor, Planning and Development in response to queries he had raised with respect to the Faculty of Social Sciences Summer Programme at the Academic Board meeting on April 30, 1992. The memorandum included the criteria for Admission into the courses, the rules governing the maximum number of courses that each student could enroll in, the names of the examiners for each course to be taught and the administration of the examinations. The letter was copied to the Campus Principal and the University Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences.

Document 5

Extract from Campus Finance & General Purposes Committee meeting held on May 1, 1992 at which the Faculty of Social Sciences Summer Programme's budgeted costs and revenues were discussed. The meeting expressed concern at the non-inclusion in the budget of non-Faculty (Campus) costs and directed that the Faculty should consult with the Bursar on the budget for the proposed

Summer Programme prior to submitting it to a meeting of the St. Augustine Planning and Estimates Committee which was scheduled for May 27, 1992.

Document 6

Extract from University Academic Committee (UAC) meeting held on May 7, 1992 which provisionally approved the initiative of the proposed Faculty of Social Sciences Summer Programme subject to the amendment of the Faculty regulations or a proposal from the Faculty to UAC with respect to the question of accrediting the Summer Programme examinations.

Document 7

Extract from University Academic Committee (UAC) meeting of May 7, 1992 at which the University Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences referred to the earlier decision re. the accreditation of the Summer Programme examinations and asked UAC to approve the holding of these examinations and to accept passes in them, towards the award of the degree. UAC approved the holding of the examinations and agreed that passes in them be accepted towards the award of the degree, subject to the approval of the Board for Examinations.

Document 8

Extract from minutes of St. Augustine Planning and Estimates Committee meeting held on May 27, 1992 in which it noted suggested amendments but also acknowledged that the suggested amendments to the Faculty of Social Sciences Summer Programme budget would not put the programme in deficit and therefore approved the Estimates subject to adequate provision being made for maintenance and examination invigilation.

Document 9

Extract from minutes of Campus Board, Faculty of Social Sciences meeting of June 4, 1992. The Board noted that the St. Augustine Planning and Estimates Committee (STAPEC) had requested that adjustments be made to the Faculty of Social Sciences Summer Programme budget to include provision for certain other identifiable costs such as the cleaning of lecture rooms and the possible increase in the sum budgeted for invigilation of examinations. The Deputy Dean (Student Matters) agreed to amend the budget in keeping with STAPEC's directive.

Document 10

Copy of a letter dated July 28, 1992 from the Senior Accountant (Budgetary Control) to the Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences confirming that accounts had been opened for the Summer Programme in the Faculty of Social Sciences for Income, Part-time Tutors and Office and General Expenses.

Document 11

Memorandum dated August 5, 1993 to the Deputy Bursar from the Senior Accountant (Salaries and Pensions) advising that he had been asked to process the payment of salaries for lecturers in the summer courses in the Faculty of Social Sciences. He raised the question of the validity of the contracts vis-à-vis the provisions of the Financial Code. He advised that the Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences could not contractually bind the University “as the status of agent does not extend to that office”. The Senior Accountant (Salaries & Pensions) further advised that several of the appointees held full time positions with the University and that this was in “direct contradiction to Clause 4 of their contracts of service”. He went on to suggest that in order to get around the problem, “the person could be granted local leave, so as to pursue the activity of lecturing in the summer courses”.

Document 12

Memorandum dated May 11, 1993 to the Assistant Registrar, Student Affairs (Admissions) from the Deputy Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences advising that the Faculty was taking full charge of the exercise as it had done the year before. He further advised that the Faculty would eventually submit to her office copies of the completed registration forms. He attached for her information a copy of the newspaper advertisement for the programme, the registration procedure and a copy of the application form.

Document 13

Extract of Academic Board meeting of June 3, 1993. The Board, at that meeting, after hearing from the Deputy Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences that no formal registration procedures were in place for enrolling non-UWI participants in the Summer Programme “directed the Faculty, in consultation with the Campus Registrar and the Head, Computer Centre to determine an appropriate registration status for non-UWI participants. Academic Board further directed the Faculty to consider the issue of an appropriate statement to those participants who successfully completed the courses and also whether the passes could be used as credits for persons wishing to pursue degree/certificate programmes in the future.

Document 14

Extract from Academic Board meeting of October 21, 1993 which noted that despite some administrative problems, the Social Sciences Summer Programme was a success with a total of 420 students participating in the programme (356 UWI and 64 outsiders). The financial report indicated that total revenue amounted to \$254,000 and a surplus of \$101,000 was realized. The Board also noted that the Faculty hoped to offer the Certificate in Public Administration and Levels 11 and 111 courses in the 1994 Summer Programme.

Document 15

Memorandum dated January 24, 1994 from Assistant Registrar, Student Affairs (Admissions) to the Dean and the Deputy Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences which dealt with the visit by Ms. VM in connection with the 1994 Summer Programme. The Assistant Registrar sought clarification of Ms M's status and advised the Dean and Deputy Dean that:

1. Courses to be offered in Summer 1994 must be approved by Academic Board.
2. Student Affairs Section supported the 1994 Summer Programme for **Registered** students of The University of the West Indies.
3. Faculty of Social Sciences was responsible for registration of the students. After the closing date for registration, forms should be submitted (**in alphabetical order**) to the Student Affairs Section for final approval.
4. Student Affairs would record results of examinations for registered students.
5. Non-registered students could **audit** courses. According to University Regulations, sitting and passing examinations in these courses would **not** qualify those participants either for entry, or for exemption/credit if they gain a University place in the future.

Document 16

Memorandum dated January 24, 1994 from the Assistant Registrar, Student Affairs (Examinations) to the Dean and Deputy Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences which dealt with the visit by Ms VM in connection with the 1994 Summer Programme. The Assistant Registrar advised that Ms VM had introduced herself as the Administrative Assistant/Public Relations Officer for the 1994 Summer Programme in the Faculty of Social Sciences. She went on to record in her memorandum comments and recommendations to Ms. M, particularly with respect to examination matters namely:

Courses
Examiners
Candidates' Lists
Preparation of Marksheets
Writing of Examinations outside of St. Augustine

Examination Cards
Deadline Dates for Submission of Question Papers
Preparation of Question Papers
Costs

Document 17

Extract from Academic Board minutes of April 7, 1994 which dealt with the 1994 Summer Programme in the Faculty of Social Sciences. The Faculty sought the Board's approval for:

- (i) the amendment of Faculty Regulations for Specially Admitted and Occasional Students to permit the admission of matriculable students not yet registered for a Degree Programme who would be referred to as "Summer Students";
- (ii) regularization of the status of Summer Students who were not currently registered in the normal year long programme to permit them to become bona fide UWI students, thereby enabling them access to the University's facilities during the summer, as well as entitling them to receive their credits on transcripts;
- (iii) automatic entry of Summer Students to the full time programme at Level II once they have completed ten Level 1 courses.

Academic Board commended the Faculty for the initiative in seeking to expand its Summer Programme but noting that a Consultant's report on Summer Programmes and related discussions at the Board for Distance Education, questioned whether the time was opportune to proceed with the proposed changes in the regulations.

The Board therefore agreed to the following:

- (i) that the Faculty continue to offer Level I courses in the Summer Programme;
- (ii) that Levels II and III courses could be offered to qualified students for one year in the first instance, subject to the satisfactory prior arrangements being made in accordance with the prescribed examination regulations.

Document 18

Extract from University Academic Committee meeting of May 6, 1994 which focused on the proposed Summer Term and the Summer Programme. The University Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences informed the meeting that while there was substantial agreement on rules that should govern such a school in the Faculty of Social Sciences, there was disagreement on one policy issue which was to what extent the Summer School should be approved as institutionally integrated into the regular University operations.

University Academic committee therefore agreed that the University Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences should send the draft regulations to St. Augustine Faculties, to the Office of Academic Affairs, to the Chairman, Board for Examinations, Standing Committee on Ordinances and Regulations (SCOR) and to the Campus Principals.. As well, the financial implications of the proposal should be transparent and made known to the Campus Bursars.

Document 19

Copy of the advertisement for the SUMMER PROGRAMME 1994 –
CERTIFICATE IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Document 20

Memorandum dated September 23, 1994 from the Head, Department of Management Studies to colleagues in the Department of Management Studies in which she indicated that at a meeting of Heads of Departments in the Faculty of Social Sciences, it was agreed that under the leadership of the Deputy Dean, the Faculty would develop a full-scale plan for rationalizing its Summer Programme, which would include a formula for the distribution of some of the surplus to the various Departments, personnel etc. The Department of Management Studies was expected to support the endeavour and she had conveyed that they were prepared to do so.

The Memorandum from the Head of the Department of Management Studies also informed colleagues in the Department that:

- (i) based on the surplus from the 1994 Summer Programme, the Department was able to draw down on the monies which would eventually come their way, to replace the carpet in the Management Lecture Theatre.
- (ii) The Deputy Dean had broached the idea of funding the reduction of the size of some of their large classes – the assumption was that a successful Summer Programme could provide the resources to make it a reality.

Document 21

Memorandum dated September 27, 1994 from the Acting Dean (Deputy Dean) to the Campus Principal which dealt with the suggestion of a procedure for appeal against Summer Programme Examination results. His memorandum read in part:

“As I explained to you in a recent telephone conversation on this matter, there is no procedure as yet in place to allow students enrolled in the Summer Programme to appeal against examination results. The Faculty is seeking your

permission to allow students who have recently taken these examinations to **exceptionally** use an appeal procedure similar to the one now in place for students enrolled in the regular programme of the University. In the meantime, we will begin taking steps to rectify this anomalous situation and to put in place proper arrangements for the Summer Programme.

The absence of appropriate regulations has been a major oversight on our part but, as you know, the conditions of urgency under which the Summer programme was introduced and continues to develop may often result in proper arrangements being put in place only on a piecemeal basis. It is also a fact that students (perhaps quite naturally) expected the same appeal procedure to apply and, in order not to make the Summer programme appear as lacking in legitimacy, I do believe that the courtesy should be extended to them.”

Document 22

Memorandum dated January 1, 1995 from the Head, Department of Economics to the Bursar advising her that the Department was holding a retreat from January 15 to January 17, 1995 in Tobago to discuss their research and teaching priorities for the remainder of the 1990s. He included a statement of the budgeted expenses for the eleven members of staff and advised that funds to cover the expenses should be taken from the Economics Department's proceeds from the Summer Programme.

Document 23

Letter dated January 4, 1995 from a Junior Research Fellow to the Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences requesting financial assistance to attend the Salzburg Seminar, in Salzburg, Austria from January 14 to January 21, 1995. A copy of the payment voucher for five thousand dollars is shown below.

Document 24

Extract from minutes of University Finance & General Purposes Committee meeting of June 3rd, 1995. The Committee noted the paper which contained the guidelines for fees and incomes for Summer Courses and Programmes submitted by the Office of Planning and Development and agreed that the bulk of the income earned through those offerings should accrue to the Faculties and to the Departments.

Document 25

Memorandum dated June 27, 1995 from the Acting Campus Bursar to the Acting Campus Principal offering suggested minor changes and comments on the Draft

Memorandum of Understanding between the Bursary and the Faculty of Social Sciences. The comments included the following:

- (i) The Bursary should be sent copies of all letters of appointment issued by the Faculty, specifying the exact Terms of Engagement.
- (ii) The fees payable should be in accordance with the U.W.I. Schedule of Rates.
- (iii) Where non-residents are engaged on the programme, the Faculty should ensure that the necessary laws are not breached.
- (iv) Fees payable to U.W.I. staff in the Programme **will be transferred** to individual personal consultancy accounts.
- (v) It is recommended that part of the income for administrative fees should be transferred to the proposed Capital Fund.
- (vi) Separate accounts will be maintained for the Summer Programme and the Computer Literacy Courses

A copy of the Draft Memorandum is shown below.

Document 26

Memorandum dated June 29, 1995 from the Senior Accountant (Budgets) to the Deputy Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences advising that the sum of \$30,000 had been transferred from the Faculty's Summer Programme account to the Library Reserve Account, as requested.

Document 27

Memorandum dated June 29, 1995 from the Senior Accountant (Budgets) to the Campus Librarian advising that a new reserve account for the grants from the Social Sciences Summer Programme had been opened. She further advised that the weekly allowances paid to the Library staff would be allocated to that account.

Document 28

Memorandum dated November 10, 1995 from the Assistant Registrar, Student Affairs (Examinations) to the Dean (Deputy Dean appointed new Dean with effect from August 1, 1995) outlining reminders with respect to the 1996 Summer Programme namely:

- (i) List of Examiners
- (ii) Registration and Change in Registration Information
- (iii) Candidates Writing Examinations at Overseas Centres
- (iv) Students from Other Faculties
- (v) Question Papers

Document 29

Memorandum dated November 16, 1995 from the Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences to the Assistant Registrar, Student Affairs (Examinations) assuring her that the Faculty would begin taking steps to deal with the matters raised. However, with particular reference to the point about “Students from Other Faculties” the Dean (formerly Deputy Dean) wrote in part:

“the Faculty will advise such students that they should seek prior approval from their Faculties before registering, if their intention is to have the Faculty of Social Sciences courses count for credit. The Faculty will not, however, make such approval a pre-requisite to registration in its courses”.

APPENDIX 7

Summary of Documents Faculty of Humanities & Education Summer Programme

Document 1

Memorandum dated June 10, 1994 from the Assistant Registrar, Students Affairs (Admissions) to the Dean, Faculty of Arts and General Studies (now Faculty of Humanities & Education) requesting a list of courses which the Faculty intended to offer in the summer of the 1993/94 academic year.

She also requested that the Dean state whether non-UWI registered students were allowed to attend and follow and sit examinations in those courses.

Document 2

Memorandum dated June 15, 1994 from the Dean, Faculty of Arts and General Studies (now Faculty of Humanities & Education) to the Assistant Registrar, Student Affairs (Admissions) indicating that only one course was to be offered in the summer of 1994, namely, English as a Foreign Language (EFL) which by definition meant that non-UWI students would be taking the course and sitting whatever examinations associated with the course.

Document 3

Extract from Academic Board minutes of the meeting held on September 29, 1994 showed that the Board, Faculty of Arts & General Studies at its meeting on September 13, 1994 expressed views on the implications of Summer School on Regulations.

Academic Board noted that the Board, Faculty of Arts & General Studies was of the view that the University should thoroughly examine the implications of Summer School Programmes as they impact on regulations governing part-time and full-time registration and the possibility of students completing the requirements for the degree in less than the time currently stipulated. In view of the ensuing discussion Academic Board agreed to set up a cross-Faculty sub-committee, with Dr. M. as convenor and comprising Faculty representatives and Registry and Bursary representatives, to examine the implications of Summer School programmes in the semester system and the future of supplemental examinations, taking into consideration the IADB Report on Summer School programmes.

Document 4

Academic Board at its meeting on September 29, 1994 noted the recommendation of the Library Committee to accommodate participants in Summer Programmes and agreed that a cross-Faculty committee should be set up to consider all factors

and cost implications with respect to the provision of common services to UWI and non-UWI registered students in Summer programmes and other income-generating programmes on the campus.

Document 5

Academic Board at its meeting on November 10, 1994 agreed to set up a sub-committee comprising Deans or nominees of the Faculties and representatives from the Bursary, Registry, Computer Centre and Library with the Campus Registrar as convenor, to consider all factors and cost implications with respect to the provision of common services to UWI and non-UWI registered students in Summer Programmes and other income generating programmes on the Campus.

Document 6

Memorandum dated May 28, 1996 from the Assistant Registrar, Student Affairs (Examinations) to the Head, Department of Language and Linguistics in which she noted the notice concerning courses to be run by the Department in the summer of 1996. She asked to be advised whether any of the courses will be assessed by final examinations.

Document 7

Memorandum dated June 26, 1996 from the Head, Department of Language and Linguistics to the Assistant Registrar (Examinations) confirming that there were no examinations associated with the Department of Language & Linguistics Summer Programme.

Document 8

Memorandum dated May 28, 1996 from the Head, Department of Language & Linguistics to the Senior Accountant (Budgetary Controls) advising that the funding of part time positions for the summer period would be from the fees collected from the courses themselves.

Document 9

A copy of an advertisement of the programme to be run by the Department of Language and Linguistics in the summer of 1996. A co-ordinator was named for each course. The end notes of the advertisement advised that with the exception of the last course which was part of an exchange programme, all the other courses were fee-paying and self-financing. It went on to state that the Department was seeking through the courses to provide a service, beyond its regular programme, to specific groups in the wider community.

Document 10

Memorandum dated June 15, 1998 from the Assistant Registrar - Student Affairs (Admissions) to the Dean, Faculty of Humanities and Education noting that she understood that certain departments in the Faculty were running 1988 summer courses. She requested as a matter of urgency a list of the courses that were being run and the names of students who had been accepted to read the courses. She emphasized that the Admissions Section must have **ALL** the information concerning students registered on the campus.

Document 11

Memorandum dated May 15, 1998 from Dr. Ian Robertson to Assistant Registrar (Admissions) and the Assistant Registrar (Examinations) advising them that the Linguistics Section of the Department of Liberal Arts had agreed to teach L24B: Structure of the English Language in the summer period May 25th – July 25th. He further advised that the Dean had approved that decision on behalf of the Faculty, and that the Computer Centre had informed the Department that registration should be internal to the Department and that the examination will need to be scheduled during the summer course examination period.

Document 12

Memorandum dated May 3, 1999 from the Director, Centre for Language Learning (Faculty of Humanities and Education) to the Campus Bursar advising that the Centre for Language Learning would be running two four-week sessions during the period June 7 to August 6, 1999. The Director sought the Bursar's advice on the fees to be charged.

Document 13

Memorandum dated June 25, 1999 from Coordinator – University English Language Courses to the Senior Assistant Registrar (Examinations) advising her of the courses to be offered during the vacation programme of the Department of Liberal Arts June 14 to July 23, 1999. She further advised that since the final examination for one of the courses was an official University Examination the question paper would be forwarded to the Examinations Section in the near future. The Coordinator also promised to make available the list of students registered for the courses.

Document 14

Academic Board at its meeting on April 12, 2001 approved the Faculty's mid-year programme 2001 and heard that the courses being offered represented a cautious expansion effort.

Document 15

A copy of the advertisement for the 2001 Mid-Year Programme which showed that English Language (Foundation) courses, Language, Linguistics & Literature courses and History courses were offered that year. The advertisement also advised of the names of persons for each set of courses who addressed queries.

Document 16

Memorandum dated January 14, 2002 from the Senior Accountant (Budgets) to the Dean, Faculty of Humanities and Education advising that the Budgets section would like to provide information on the activities of the Summer Programmes within a reasonable period after the teaching and examinations have ended but needed cooperation in certain areas to effectively do so. Some of the problems she identified were:

- (i) the fact that students did not always identify the faculty where courses were taken
- (ii) late submission of claims for teaching

She recommended that each faculty be assigned a unique colour for the summer school registration form which should clearly indicate the account number to which the income should be allocated. A cut off date of mid July for refunds of fees to students was also recommended. With respect to expenditure, she advised that claims for teaching in the summer programme should be submitted in a timely manner. The end of August of each year was the suggested date.

Document 17

The Board for Undergraduate Studies at its meeting on May 31st, 2000 received BUS P. 32 which contained a report on the Summer School programme across the three campuses. Of particular interest were the concerns raised with respect to the maintenance of quality in the delivery and examination of Summer courses, the lack of administrative support, the registration process and the limited access to library facilities. The report concluded by identifying several areas that required attention. These were:

1. The appointment of teaching staff
2. The obligations of lecturers and examiners
3. The methods of assessment
4. Course evaluation
5. The role of campus administration

During the discussion, the following comments and observations were made:

- (a) The perception that the Summer School was a less rigorous option, was not supported by the pass/fail rates set out in Appendix C of BUS. P. 32.

- (b) Over-dependence on part time/temporary staff was a disservice to students
- (c) Summer School should be considered a part time semester
- (d) One argument for a third semester was accelerated throughout

The Board AGREED that the Committee of Deans should be asked to draft guidelines concerning the treatment of the Summer session as an adjunct semester, and given the wide implications, support structures such as the Registry and Bursary should be included in the discussions.

Document 18

Memorandum dated August 8, 2003 from the Dr. V. Youssef, outgoing Deputy Dean, Distance and Outreach to the Dean, Faculty of Humanities and Education in which she provided a summary report on the summer programme 2003. Among other things she advised the programme expanded again that year with a total of 18 courses which were offered to approximately 460 students. She also advised that for the first time student from foreign universities were admitted and that these students will transfer credits gained from the summer programme to their home programmes.

With respect to projections for the future, she advised that there were plans to offer more courses in 2004, that there were plans to take in more students from foreign universities, both individually and as a group and that the costs for such groups needed to be standardized. As well, there we plans to offer a programme in Tobago (sister isle) the following year as part of the first year pilot project there.

Document 19

Memorandum dated March 17, 2004 from C. Fergus, Deputy Dean (Distance and Outreach) to Accounting Supervisor (Students), Bursary in which he enclosed a list of twenty-seven courses and relevant fee charges for courses to be offered in the 2004 summer programme.

Document 20

Memorandum dated April 19, 2005 from the Senior Accountant (Treasury and Investments) to the Dean, Faculty of Humanities and Education advising him that the printers had delivered the three part deposit slips that day and she was therefore sending 200 such slips for distribution to students in his Faculty. She advised that the new system required the Faculty to give the new deposit slips to the student after the completion of the registration from and agreement of the applicable fees. Payment for summer programme was no longer required at the Bursary but should be made at Republic Bank using the three part deposit slip only.

Document 21

Memorandum dated March 7, 2005 from the Librarian attached to the School of Education Library to the Head, School of Education advising that during the summer school in 2004 the library remained opened until 9.00 p.m. Monday to Thursday to facilitate summer students. That was made possible with the agreement to give library staff overtime payments. She therefore requested a similar arrangement for 2005. Her request was subsequently approved after a reminder memorandum dated March 31, 2005.

Document 22

Minute 38 – Faculty Board meeting of November 2, 1993

Views of the History Department with respect to a Faculty Summer Programme

“There was consensus that it was unreasonable to expect full time staff to teach Summer courses, in view of a greatly increased leading load, the greater expectations for research output as a condition of promotion, and the extreme difficulty in getting sabbatical or research leave at St. Augustine. Also, even if funds were available to pay part time staff (tutors, post graduates) to teach courses in the summer, full time staff would still have to undertake administrative, monitoring and examination responsibilities during that period”.

Document 23

Minute 59 - Faculty Board Meeting of November 2, 1993

Views of the Department of Language and Linguistics with respect to a Faculty Summer Programme

“The Board noted that the Department had agreed that for reasons connected with the academic integrity of lecturers, as well as the question of assessment and promotions, it was essential for free time to be provided for research, and that such free time was diminishing as a result of the semester system”.

Document 24

Faculty Board at its meeting on February 6, 1996 noted that Academic Board had agreed to its recommendation that registration in a summer programme must be with the approval of the Faculty in which the student was officially registered.

Document 25

Faculty Board at its meeting on October 14, 1997 agreed on the membership of Faculty Committee for the 1997/1998 academic year including a Summer Programme Committee consisting of:

Dr. B. Lalla	Chairperson
Mrs. R. Pemberton	History Department
Dr. B Hurst	School of Education
Dr. V. Youssef	Language and Linguistics Department

APPENDIX 8

Summary of Documents Faculty of Natural Sciences Summer Programme

Document 1

Memorandum dated April 5, 1993 from Dean, [Ramsey Saunders] Faculty of Natural Sciences to the Campus Registrar advising him that at the last meeting of Academic Board the Deputy Principal, had asked him to prepare a budget for summer courses to be mounted by the Faculty for presentation to STAPEC and F&GPC. The budget for the Physics P10A and P10B courses was then presented.

Document 2

Memorandum dated April 21, 1993 from Dean, [Ramsey Saunders] Faculty of Natural Sciences to the Campus Registrar and the Campus Bursar advising that further to his memorandum of April 5, 1993, he wished to submit the proposed budget for special summer courses in BT10A and BT10B.

Document 3

Academic Board at its meeting on June 3, 1993 approved the proposal to mount special summer courses in CS11A, CS11B, M10A and M10B subject to re-examination of the fees and budget for these courses.

Document 4

Memorandum dated April 28, 1994 from the Deputy Dean (Distance Education) Faculty of Natural Sciences to the Senior Accountant (Budgetary Control) informing him that the Faculty of Natural Sciences would be offering a Summer programme in 1994. The Departments of Plant Science, Physics and Mathematics & Computer Sciences would be offering the following courses:

BT10A&B; P10A&B CS11A&B CS20A and
MS10A&B

He asked that special accounts for the three departments to be opened to accommodate the payment of fees and attached a copy of the Summer Programme Notification and a copy of the Application Form.

Document 5

A copy of the 1994 Summer Programme Notification which contained among other things, the names of the courses to be offered, the names of contact persons for each course (Secretarial staff in the respective departments), the limit of the number of courses per applicant (two), the cost per course and the date on which

applications would be closed. The notice also advised that application forms were available from the respective departments in the Faculty of Natural Sciences.

Document 6

Memorandum dated October 2, 1994 from the Senior Accountant Budgetary Control to the Deputy Dean (Distance Education) confirming that accounts had been opened for each department. The Senior Accountant also advised that sub accounts had also been opened to each course namely:

110	Fees paid to part-time academic staff
500	Office and general expenses
900	Income from fees

Document 7

A memorandum dated May 6, 1994 from the Deputy Dean, Distance Education & Outreach) to the Assistant Registrar, Student Affairs (Admissions) advising that the Faculty of Natural Sciences would be offering a Summer Programme in 1994. A copy of the Summer Programme Notification and a copy of the Application Form were enclosed for her guidance.

Document 8

A memorandum dated July 21, 1995 from the Ag. Dean, (Charles Mc David) Faculty of Natural Sciences to the Assistant Registrar (Examinations), in response to her memorandum of July 17, 1995. The Ag. Dean reported that he had discussed the matter with a representative of Mathematics and Computer Sciences 'which was remiss in not sending the list through the faculty office, and confirm that the candidates (some of whom are from the Faculty of Arts or Social Sciences), are eligible to write the examinations".

The Ag. Dean (Charles Mc David) also commented that "it is quite clear that the way these summer courses are administered is far from satisfactory and that we need to put proper procedures in place to avoid confusion and error. Perhaps discussion on this aspect can be initiated by your office".

Document 9

A memorandum dated January 29, 1996 from the Campus Registrar to Deans of Faculties enclosing a copy of the Guidelines for Fees and Incomes for Summer Courses/Programmes which was approved by UAC and F&GPC in June, 1995 with the undertaking given by the Vice-Chancellor at UAC that the computation and retention of the University Centre costs should be deferred for the time being.

The Registrar noted that the above implied that, in the case of St. Augustine Campus, the costing of self-financing courses/programmes should include the Faculty costs as identified in Guideline 2 with 29% of such costs added for library and administrative services. Similarly, the surplus from a course should be

divided between the Faculty and the Campus in the ratio 100:29 so that 77.5% of the surplus should accrue to the Faculty for use in accordance with Guideline 4.

(Note: 8 guidelines were listed which included guideline 1 which read: Courses and programmes should generate financial surpluses i.e. an excess of revenues over costs. The underlying principles for pricing the courses and programmes should be (i) cost recovery and (ii) revenue generation.

Document 10

A memorandum dated May 13, 1996 from the Acting Head, Department of Mathematics and Computer Science to the Senior Accountant (Budgets) [which was copied to the Dean, Faculty of Natural Sciences] informing her that the Department would be offering a summer programme in 1996 and identifying the courses that would be offered. A copy of the advertisement and registration form were attached.

The Acting Head also referred to a telephone conversation between himself and the Senior Accountant and reiterated that the two separate accounts to accommodate the payment of fees (one for Mathematics courses and one of Computer courses) should be merged into one account.

Document 11

Academic Board at its meeting on March 27, 1997 supported in principle recommendations from the Board, Faculty of Agriculture and Natural Sciences in relation to the mounting of a viable Summer Programme which required amendments to Faculty Regulations:

- (a) Supplementals in the Faculty of Agriculture & Natural Sciences should be continued for all courses in the School of Agriculture and for Level I courses in Natural Sciences, but that the minimum mark for the award of a supplemental should be increased to 35%.
- (b) A fee should be charged for each supplemental examination sat.
- (c) Summer courses should be mounted for all Level I and some Level II courses for students who wish to repeat the courses in the Summer and for non-registered students, where possible.
- (d) A fee related to the cost of delivery of the courses would be charged.
- (e) The School of Natural Sciences should make active use of orals for advanced level courses (as is done in Agriculture) and departments should be allowed to administer these as soon as the marks are available, and prior to the examiner's meeting. The cut-off mark for award of an oral should be 35%.

Document 12

A memorandum dated May 19, 1997 from the Dean, Faculty of Agriculture and Natural Sciences to the Bursar advising that the Faculty would be mounting a summer programme of remedial teaching for Year I students failing Semester I

and II courses during the 1996/1997 academic year. (A copy of the notice and registration form was attached). The Dean asked for arrangements to be made for an account to be opened to deposit fees for students in the School of Natural Sciences. With respect to fees for students from the School of Agriculture the Bursar was advised to deposit same in a separate specified account.

Document 13

A memorandum dated June 10, 1997 from the Secretary, Board for Undergraduate Studies to Principals, Campus Registrars, Assistant Registrars (Examinations) and Deans of all Faculties informing them that BUS at its meeting on May 28, 1997 approved the “Regulations Governing the Summer Schools” having taken into account the comments and adjustments suggested by Academic Boards. She informed them that the **“regulations which become effective immediately”** was attached for information and circulation as necessary. [Put copy in appendices]

Document 14

Memorandum dated June 15, 1998 from Dean, Faculty of Agriculture and Natural Sciences to Assistant Registrar (Examinations) concerning the Semester I Summer Programme Registration. Lists of students in the Schools of Agriculture and Natural Sciences who had registered for the Semester I, 1998 Summer Programme in the Faculty as well as a copy of the revised advertisement of the programme were attached to the memorandum.

Document 15

Memorandum dated June 15, 1998 from the Assistant Registrar, Student Affairs (Admissions) to the Dean, Faculty of Agriculture and Natural Sciences advising that she understood that certain Departments in the Faculty were running 1998 summer courses and would therefore be grateful to know as a matter of urgency which courses were being run and the names of students who were accepted to read those courses. She ended by saying that “you will appreciate that in the Admissions Section we must have ALL information concerning students registered at this Campus”.

Document 16

Memorandum dated June 16, 1998 from the Dean, Faculty of Agriculture and Natural Sciences to the Assistant Registrar, Student Affairs (Admissions) apologizing for the delay in forwarding the information. The relevant information on the Faculty’s 1998 Summer Programme was enclosed.

Document 17

Memorandum dated October 28, 1998 from the Senior Accountant (Budgets) to the Dean, Faculty of Agriculture and Natural Sciences advising that a statement of income and expenditure for the 1997 vacation courses offered by the Faculty was

attached. She advised that there was a balance of \$28,198.50 remaining at the end of the programme which had been carried forward to the next year. She further advised that the staff were working on the details of the 1998 statement and promised that it would soon be finalized.

Document 18

Memorandum dated October 19, 1999 from the Chair, Board for Undergraduate Studies to Campus Registrars, Cave Hill, Mona and St. Augustine advising that the Board was conducting a review of the Summer School programmes on the campuses. The aim of the review was to determine whether there was equivalency in the quality of the provision between that of the Summer School courses and the same courses taught in either Semester I or 2 (regular course).

Documents **Faculty of Agriculture Long Vacation Programme**

Document 19

Board, Faculty of Agriculture at its meeting on March 13, 1988 discussed Paper 53 which contained the Report of the Faculty Sub-committee on long Vacation Teaching in the Faculty of Agriculture. The Board considered the details of the Summer Programme 1988 and agreed to recommend to University Academic Committee (UAC) through Academic Board that a Summer Programme of courses offered in the Faculty of Agriculture be mounted in the summer of 1988 in accordance with the scheme outlined in Paper 53. The headings of the scheme included:

- (i) Eligibility to Register for Course(s)
- (ii) Students who had sat and failed the Course
- (iii) Students who were pre-empting Courses
- (iv) Fee Structure

(My note: All participants were registered Agriculture students)

Document 20

Academic Board at its meeting on April 28, 1988 agreed to recommend to University Academic Committee (UAC) approval of the proposed Faculty of Agriculture long vacation programme as detailed in Paper 53 on an experimental basis for 1988.

Document 21

Memorandum dated June 28, 1988 from the Co-ordinator (Summer Term) to the Campus Registrar informing the Registry and the Bursary that the Faculty of Agriculture was holding a Summer Term Programme for 1987/88 commencing on Wednesday 6th July, 1988 and ending on Friday 2nd September, 1988. He requested that the programme be serviced by the Registry's Students' Affairs Section and the Bursary's Students' Accounts Section.

Document 22

Memorandum dated December 21, 1988 from Senior Accountant (Revenue and Cash Management) to the Programme Co-ordinator, Faculty of Agriculture Summer Programme to which a Statement of Income and Expenditure for the Faculty of Agriculture Summer Programme was attached. It showed a surplus of \$1,800 after expenses had been paid. The statement also showed that the net income collected was \$14,250.

Document 23

Memorandum dated February 7, 1990 from Senior Accountant (Revenue and Cash Management) to the Programme Co-ordinator, Faculty of Agriculture Summer Programme to which a Statement of Income and Expenditure for the Faculty of Agriculture Summer Programme was attached. It showed an income of \$37,300. After expenses had been paid a surplus of \$4,310 was realized. The total surplus for 1988 and 1989 then stood at \$6,110.

The Senior Accountant (Revenue and Cash Management) advised that the Bursary was concerned about the level of fees charged the students advising that an average fee of \$525 each would have been more equitable and would have yielded a surplus of \$980.

Document 24

Academic Board at its meeting on November 2, 1989 approved retroactively the offering of year 1, 2, & 3 Agriculture courses during the 1989 summer vacation to those students who needed the courses either to proceed in the degree programmes or to graduate.

One member reminded Academic board that its reluctance in giving blanket approval for the offering of course in the summer was based on uncertainty about the status of the course lecturers and the Board was informed that lecturers appointed to the Faculty of Agriculture had taught the courses offered in the 1989 summer. The Board then approved of the Faculty of Agriculture continuing its summer programme subject to the courses being taught by University appointed lecturers.

Document 25

Faculty Board at its meeting on November 9 1992 was informed by the Co-ordinator of the Summer Programme that he had to make a decision and he had decided that the Summer Programme for 1992 should be cancelled in view of the following:

- (i) students felt that the cost of the courses in the programme was too high

- (ii) As a result of (i) above, there were insufficient numbers of students registered in the respective courses to mount the programme
- (iii) Only approximately twelve (12) students had paid

Document 26

Faculty Board at its meeting on March 8, 1993 received Paper 33 which contained matters from the minutes of a meeting of Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) held on February 26, 1993. The following matters were discussed:

The Semester System – [International] Summer Programme

The Board noted AAC recommendations that the outreach aspect of a summer programme should be addressed by CEPAT, for servicing foreign students from outside the region. Internally, the Faculty should continue to support a remedial programme, where was economically feasible to do so.

The Dean indicated to the Board that the then Vice Chancellor was anxious for Faculties to embark on an **International** Summer Programme so as to attract persons from outside the Region. He also expressed the view that if the summer period were devoted to teaching, the research capacity of staff would be greatly reduced.

In considering the matter the Board noted one staff member's view that the whole issue of a Summer Programme was a disincentive to young staff as UWI placed greater emphasis on research and publications as against teaching activities. In addition, he noted that many departments were at the present time greatly understaffed and hence it would be difficult for them to participate in a Summer Programme.

Faculty Board, while supporting the introduction of an International Summer Programme, was of the view that there was a need for the provision of additional resources to undertake the Programme. The Board agreed that the Faculty would participate in the Summer Programme as follows:

- (i) CEPAT would service the international market
- (ii) The Faculty would continue to offer a remedial programme through Departments, as existed at the present time
- (iii) Departments would be asked to investigate the possibility of introducing a 'fast track' programme for Part 1 courses

Document 27

Memorandum dated June 10, 1994 from the Assistant Registrar, Student Affairs (Admissions) to the Dean, Faculty of Agriculture in which she asked for a list of courses which the Faculty intended to offer in the summer of 1993/94. She also asked the Dean to state whether non-UWI registered students were being allowed to follow and sit examinations in the stated courses.

Document 28

Memorandum from the Acting Dean, Faculty of Agriculture dated July 19, 1995 to the Assistant Registrar (Examinations) asking for an examination to be placed back to its original date (prior to the ill advised revision) which would allow the Faculty enough time to complete lectures as scheduled in the Faculty's Summer Programme.

Document 29

Memorandum from Assistant Registrar (Examinations) dated July 28, 1995 to the Coordinator, Summer Programme advising him of the new examination date and time for two courses. The Assistant Registrar (Examinations) also indicated that she acceded to the request, notwithstanding the regulation that "In no case any such change be made later than one week prior to the commencement of the series of examinations".

Document 30

Copy of advertisement dated April 9, 1999 which advertised the Faculty of Agriculture and Natural Sciences Summer Programme 1999. The list of courses to be offered from the School of Natural Sciences and the School of Agriculture were listed along with the number of contact hours, the course dates and the examination dates. The advertisement also informed that prospective students were required to complete an application form which was available in the Office of the Dean, Faculty of Agriculture and Natural Sciences or at the Admissions Section (Administration Building).

APPENDIX 9

Summary of Documents Continuing Engineering Education Centre

Document 1

Memorandum dated February 7, 1973 from the Chairman of the Continuing Education Committee to the Accountant (Budgets) advising him of the establishment of the Committee. The Chairman requested an account number into which income from the fees for the courses to be mounted should be put into and to which expenses should be charged. The Accountant (Budgets) was also advised that the authorization for the use of the funds will come from the Chairman of the Committee. A copy of the terms of reference of the committee was attached. These were:

Document 2

Extract from Minutes of Meeting of Board, Faculty of Engineering held on May 9, 1973 at which approval was granted to the Continuing Education Committee for the mounting of seven (7) courses in the 1973/74 academic year. The Board noted that some of the courses had already been mounted.

Document 3

Memorandum dated February 12, 1974 from the Campus Secretary to the Public Relations Co-ordinator asking him to place a two column four-inch ad in a regional newspaper advertising the course in Solar Energy.

Document 4

Memorandum dated June 8, 1978 from the Assistant Dean, Continuing Education, Research and Postgraduate Affairs to the Chairman, Continuing Education Committee advising him that he needed to prepare a report for him for forwarding to the Planning and Estimates Committee, who had requested a report on the state of continuing education in the Faculty. The report should include:

1. The composition of the sub-committee
2. The frequency of meetings
3. The programme for the 1977/78 session
4. The rate of payment to lecturers
5. A statement of accounts for the Continuing Education funds
6. The rate of fees charged
7. The procedure and purpose for which funds are disbursed.

Document 5

Extract from minutes of meeting of Board, Faculty of Engineering held on May 11, 1978 in which it was agreed that to protect members of that Committee, any approval of an application by members of that Committee for funding from Continuing Education Committee funds should be signed by the Chairman and the Assistant Dean concerned with Continuing Education.

Document 6

Status report on Standing Committee on Continuing Education, Faculty of Engineering dated September 15, 1978 from Chairman, Continuing Education Committee to the Assistant Dean, Continuing Education, Research and Postgraduate Affairs which provided information under the following headings:

1. Background information which included the terms of reference of the committee
2. Courses held since the inception and number of persons who attended
3. Composition of Committee
4. Programme for 1977/78 session
5. Statement of Accounts
6. Disbursement of Funds

Document 7

Extract from Minutes of meeting of Board, Faculty of Engineering held on December 8, 1978 which contained the minutes of a meeting of the Continuing Education Committee held on December 5, 1978. The Board noted the contents and in the course of the discussion agreed that a procedure should be put in place for the disbursement of funds from income accrued to the committee.

Document 8

Extract from minutes of meeting of Board, Faculty of Engineering held on November 13, 1980. The Board approved the mounting of three courses “subject to the operation of a realistic registration deadline by the Course Director to ensure that the course would not be mounted if it seemed likely that they would not be economically feasible”.

Document 9

Memorandum dated February 11, 1981 from the Campus Bursar to the Dean, Faculty of Engineering advising that it had been brought to his attention that the Faculty was running short courses in continuing education within the Faculty. He further advised that the Bursary’s investigation revealed that fees for the courses were not deposited into the Bursary which was in direct contravention of the Clauses 47 and 48 of the Financial Code. He also asked the Dean to apprise him of the following:

1. Who is responsible in your Faculty for collecting funds for short courses
2. Who authorizes expenditure on these accounts
3. Is there a Bank Account in the Faculty
4. What contributions are being made to the Faculty Consultancy Fund in respect of fees received, if any

Document 10

Memorandum dated February 23, 1981 from the Dean, Faculty of Engineering to the Campus Bursar expressing surprise at the statements and questions in the Bursar's letter to him dated February 11, 1981. The Dean informed the Bursar that the "Faculty had been running short courses for several years under the aegis of its Continuing Education Committee, the Chairman of which is Dr. M.W. Chin. Not only have all monies been paid into the Bursary but also there has been a Special Account for years. This account has the number 70-504 and is under the control of your office. Expenditure from the Account can only be authorized on the signature of the Chairman of the Continuing Education Committee and the Assistant Dean (Continuing Education, Research and Postgraduate Matters). Moreover, such expenditure must be approved by the Committee".

The Dean further informed the Bursar that the Faculty had no Bank account and again expressed surprise that that question was posed. He further advised that there was no relationship whatever between the Faculty Consultancy Fund and the Continuing Education Fund.

Document 11

Extract from minutes of meeting of Board, Faculty of Engineering held on February 12, 1981 which dealt with the Faculty of Engineering's response to the decision of Academic Board that a Campus Central Committee would be established to oversee the management of short courses on the Campus. It was felt that such a committee would "increase bureaucracy and would be counter-productive". It was suggested that guidelines for Faculties should be laid down instead.

It was also felt that compensation to University personnel for participating in short courses should not be fixed at a level where it could be regarded as a significant source of income. "Payment should therefore be limited to the level of an Honorarium with an upper limit to be fixed."

Document 12

Memorandum dated July 13, 1981 from the Campus Secretary to the Assistant Dean (Continuing Education, Research and Postgraduate Affairs) advising that he had been in discussion with the Campus Bursar with respect to the use of funds generated from the Continuing Education Programme and was therefore seeking clarification about the Programme.

Document 13

Memorandum dated July 16, 1981 from Assistant Dean (Continuing Education, Research and Postgraduate Affairs) to the Campus Secretary outlining how Continuing Education was conducted in the Faculty of Engineering. He also expressed surprise that the Bursar was not aware of the procedure since “this is the procedure which has been in operation with the Bursary for quite sometime now”.

Document 14

Letter dated July 22, 1981 from the Campus Secretary to the Assistant Dean (Continuing Education, Research and Postgraduate Affairs) thanking him for his memorandum of July 16, 1981 which clarified the situation for him. However, he indicated that there was one area on which he wanted to comment i.e. the payment of \$50 per lecture to lecturers involved in the programme. He advised that if those lecturers included University lecturers then it would be contrary to a Finance and General Purposes Committee decision (F.M. 88(B) (i) of March 12, 1977, which says that “academic staff members should not receive remuneration for additional duties within the University”. Such staff members could be rewarded by financial assistance to attend conferences or to pursue research.

Document 15

Memorandum dated July 27, 1981 from the Assistant Dean (Continuing Education, Research and Postgraduate Affairs) to the Campus Secretary. The memorandum dealt with the issue of the violation of the financial code and the resultant sudden non-payment to members of staff concerned. The Assistant Dean advised that the payment of \$50.00 per lecture does not exclude the lecturer from applying and receiving financial assistance to attend conferences etc. The Secretary was also informed that the short courses scheduled for the summer (1981) had been cancelled and the Faculty was of the view that it may be due to the non-payment as proposed by the Faculty of Engineering committee on Continuing Education. The Assistant Dean ended by saying that he agreed that the matter of payment to lecturers, who were members of staff, needed careful study “but I am afraid that we are likely to do more harm than good by the drastic measures we are applying all of a sudden”.

Document 16

Memorandum dated August 17, 1981 from the Chairman, Continuing Education Campus Central Committee to the Campus Principal on the subject “Continuing Education – Cessation of Payment, Faculty of Engineering”. The Chairman asked the Principal to seek a waiver of the Finance and General Purposes Committee ruling (decision F.M. 88(B) (i) of March 12, 1977) which says that academic staff members should not receive remuneration for additional duties within the University.

The Chairman also asked the Principal to release the funds from the Faculty of Engineering Continuing Education Account, so that the Faculty could meet its

commitment to five staff members. He reminded the Principal that the ban was introduced by the Campus Bursar through a Memorandum dated 30th June, 1981 on the establishment of the Campus Central committee for Continuing Education and his appointment as Chairman by Academic Board at its meeting of May 28, 1981. However, since the other members of the Committee were not yet named it was impossible to get the required approval by the Central Committee. The Principal was also advised that the ban on payment was creating embarrassment to the Faculty of Engineering and was also having an adverse effect on this Continuing Education Programme since a number of courses had been cancelled since the ban. The Chairman asked the Principal to have the waiver instituted until the Central committee became operative, when it would put forward its own proposal. As well, he asked the Principal, in order to have a smooth transition, to empower the Chairman of the Central Committee to act on its behalf (in consultation with the Principal) until the Central Committee became operational.

Document 17

Letter dated August 25, 1981 to the Chairman, Campus Central Committee for Continuing Education from the Campus Principal advising him that he was unable to condone the violation of the general rules of the University or the financial rules, nor was the Bursar empowered to do so. He also advised that he had discussed the matter with the Vice Chancellor who had expressed great concern that a situation such as this could have developed in a section of the University. However, the Vice Chancellor recognized that the Chairman had acted in good faith with the best interest of the Faculty and University in mind and therefore he authorized the payments the Chairman had authorized, but indicated that no further payments should be made until a proper scheme duly authorized by the relevant bodies had been approved (e.g. Academic Board, Finance committee, Appointments Committee, Finance and General Purposes Committee, where relevant). He promised that the matter would be dealt with and regularized in the new Academic Year.

Document 18

Memorandum dated December 29th, 1981 from Mr. Clement Imbert, Lecturer to the Head, Department of Mechanical Engineering requesting his advice, support and assistance in bringing off a proposed seminar on Metal Working during the period February 15-19, 1982 in light of the uncertainties regarding short courses in the Faculty.

Document 19

Memorandum dated December 30, 1981 from the Head, Department of Mechanical Engineering to the Chairman, Campus Committee on Continuing Education seeking permission to hold the seminar. He also asked the Chairman to advise Mr. Imbert of any formalities and procedures that he would need to follow.

Document 20

Memorandum dated January 6, 1982 from the Chairman, Campus Committee on Continuing Education to the Head, Department of Mechanical Engineering granting approval to hold the seminar on Metal Working (February 15-19, 2002) subject to certain conditions. Some of these were:

1. Approval by the Faculty of Engineering sub-committee for Continuing Education
2. No financial loss to be incurred
3. That there be **no payment of any kind** to lecturers involved in the running of the seminar (item 6 of your memo dated 29/12/81)

Document 21

Minutes of a meeting of a Central Campus Committee on Continuing Education courses held on January 26, 1982. Among the issues discussed were proposed guidelines for running short courses, remuneration of staff teaching in continuing education courses and allocation of surplus funds generated by continuing education courses. The members of the committee expressed strong objection to the stand taken by the St. Augustine Planning and Estimates Committee (STAPEC) with respect to the allocation of surplus funds. The committee agreed to recommend to STAPEC that surplus funds should be allocated on a 50-50 basis to the Central Committee and to the Department/Faculty generating the funds, since the Departments/Faculties were not likely to organize Continuing Education Courses if none of the funds generated were to accrue to the Department/Faculty concerned.

Document 22

Memorandum dated May 21, 1982 from the Campus Bursar to the Chairman, Central Campus Committee on Continuing Education concerning a request from the Head, Department of Physics for remuneration to two permanent staff members from another Faculty who had lectured on short courses. The Bursar advised the Chairman that the recommendation "that members of staff who are required to lecture on short courses will be paid provided a declaration is given by the Head of Department that the lectures are in excess of their normal teaching load" had not yet been approved by the Finance and General Purposes Committee. The Bursar further advised that pending such approval emoluments earned by permanent members of staff who teach short courses will be credited to the Departmental Consultancy Funds and will be made available to members of staff in accordance with existing rules, "that is, for research and travel to conferences".

Document 23

A report dated May 1982 from Mr. Clement Imbert, Lecturer and Course Director for the short course on Metal Working which was held from February 15-19, 1982. Mr. Imbert reported that the course was very successful based on the quality of the course content, the quality of the lecturer/presenters, the number of

participants (56) and the healthy surplus realized albeit a sizeable portion was still outstanding.

Document 24

Extract from Minutes of meeting of Board, Faculty of Engineering held on October 21, 1982 which provided information on the approved membership of Faculty, Campus and University Committees. The Continuing Education Committee consisted of:

1. Dr. M.W. Chin (Chairman)
2. Dr. D.R. McGaw
3. Mr. R. Charles
4. Dr. A.J. Parris
5. Mr. C. Imbert
6. Mrs. I. Regis (Secretary)

Document 25

Memorandum dated February 20, 1985 from Assistant Registrar (Secretariat) to Secretary, Faculty of Engineering Continuing Education Committee which provided a response to the Secretary's query on the status of the Campus committee on Continuing Education under University Restructuring. The Assistant Registrar advised that the Campus Committee on Continuing Education was **not** retained and was therefore no longer in existence (Academic Board Minute 161 of 1984-11-22 refers).

Document 26

Extract from Minutes of meeting of Board, Faculty of Engineering held on February 6, 1986 in which the Board agreed to recommend to the St. Augustine Planning and Estimates Committee that honoraria should be paid to all University teaching staff participating in Continuing Education courses, the quantum to be decided on the basis of the course budget but with an upper limit. It was also agreed that alternatively surplus funds from any course could be allocated for the use of University lecturers on that particular course for attending conferences, purchasing books, equipment etc.

Document 27

Matters from the sub-committee of Campus Finance and General Purposes Committee meeting held on February 28, 1986 in which approval was granted for the payment of honoraria for short courses/seminars in the Faculty of Engineering.

Document 28

Memorandum dated June 6, 1986 from the Administrative Officer, Faculty of Engineering to the Chairman, Continuing Education Committee formally advising him that the Board, Faculty of Engineering at its meeting on May 15, 1986 agreed that the "Continuing Education Committee be requested to submit to the Board a

report detailing the number of courses and seminars which had been conducted during 1985/86, the names of persons to whom grants had been made and for what purpose, the quantum, and whether or not they had submitted a report”.

Document 29

Faculty Board at its meeting on October 16, 1986 approved the recommendation that Mr. Clement Imbert be appointed Chairman of the Continuing Education Committee for the 1986/87 academic year.

Document 30

Faculty Board at its meeting on October 16, 1986 received Paper 16 which contained a report from the Continuing Education Committee detailing the financial assistance granted in 1985/86 and listing the seminars/short courses held in 1985/86.

Document 31

Faculty Board at its meeting on November 27, 1986 endorsed the decision of the Continuing Education Committee and agreed to recommend to Finance and General Purposes Committee that:

- (i) 15% of the surplus funds from Continuing Education courses/seminars would be deposited in an appropriate general campus account for the benefit of the University whose physical resources were being used in continuing education courses.
- (ii) the remainder of the surplus funds would be shared between the Continuing Education Committee general account and a special account which would have provisions for the allocation of funds for University Lecturers on that particular course.

Document 32

Extract from minutes of Campus Finance and General Purposes Committee meeting held on January 23, 1987 in which the following approval with respect to the apportionment of surplus funds from Continuing Education Committee courses/seminars was granted:

- (i) that 15% of the surplus funds be deposited in a general campus account for the benefit of the University whose physical resources were used in continuing education courses; and
- (ii) that the remainder of the surplus funds be shared equally between a special account for each of the lecturers involved in teaching the particular course and the Continuing Education Committee general account; each specific account and the general account to be used for meeting expenses incurred for attendance at conferences and other staff development activities.

Document 33

Faculty Board at its meeting on March 17, 1988 agreed in principle to the proposal for the establishment of a full-time Continuing Education Centre **[to replace the Continuing Education Committee]** in the Faculty. The Committee was of the view that in light of the then economic and financial situation facing both the nation and the UWI, it was imperative for the Faculty of Engineering to consider the establishment of a full time unit to conduct such continuing education activities on an income generating basis. The full proposal was attached as Appendix 1 to the minutes.

Document 34

Appendix to BFE P35 (1988/89) which contained the Revised Guidelines for the Apportionment and Disbursement of surplus funds in lieu of honoraria for short courses/seminars conducted by the CEC in the Faculty of Engineering.

Document 35

Memorandum dated November 12, 1990 from Chairman, Continuing Education to Accountant (Systems and Audit) with respect to the Internal Audit Report done by the Bursary officials dated July 24, 1990. The Chairman agreed with most of the recommendations which included the recommendation that course participants should pay at the Bursary before the day of the course/seminar. He advised that it may not be possible for this to be done by all participants and felt that it would not be wise to refuse acceptance of payment at the Faculty.

Document 36

Memorandum dated February 16, 1993 from the Assistant Dean, Services, Faculty of Engineering to the Campus Registrar advising that the Continuing Education Committee of the Faculty was very active and conducted over twenty (20) short courses/seminars annually with an average attendance of twenty participants per course/seminar. In order to facilitate faster communication between the Continuing Education Committee office and prospective course participants and sponsoring agencies an urgent request was being made for the conversion of the internal telephone line to one in which external calls could be made.

Document 37

Memorandum dated September 9, 1993 from the Chairman, continuing Education Committee to the Senior Accountant (Projects and Cash Management) requesting that a cheque be made out to the Trinidad Hilton Hotel to secure bookings for participants for an upcoming symposium. The Chairman noted that cheques from prospective participants totaling the equivalent sum had been deposited into the Bursary.

Document 38

Memorandum dated November 10, 1993 from the Account (Project and Cash Management) to the Chairman, Continuing Education Committee (CEC) with respect to the discussions they had with respect to the enhancing of the servicing of the Continuing Education Project. These included:

- (i) the issue of an official receipt book to the CEC to facilitate late payment of fees on the morning of a programme.
- (ii) the need for reimbursement requests to be supported by original documents, with photocopies being kept by the CEC.
- (iii) the possibility of the CEC donating a PC and printer to the Bursary.

The Accountant enclosed with the memorandum a receipt book and a proforma invoice in the sum of US\$2928.00 representing cost of acquisition of the PC and printer.

Document 39

Memorandum date July 27, 1994 from the Chairman, Continuing Engineering Education Centre to the Senior Accountant (Projects and Cash Management) advising that the Centre was about to conduct Food Technology workshops in St. Lucia (August 8-12), St. Vincent (August 15-19) and Tortola (August 22-September 2). As such he was requesting cheques and advance sums of money totaling over US\$ 9000 for the resource team before their departure on August 7.

Document 40

Memorandum dated February 28, 1996 from the Chairman, Continuing Engineering Education Centre to the Assistant Registrar (Personnel) referring to the advertisement and subsequent selection of a Training Coordinator by way of shortlisting and an interview. The Chairman was now requesting that the selected candidate be hired "in a non-established post" with effect from March 4, 1996 for a period of six months in the first instance. He further advised that "her emoluments shall be paid by the Continuing Engineering Education Centre.

Document 41

A copy of the Engineering Institute's Manager's report which was presented at the Engineering Institute Board of Directors meeting which was held on June 30, 1996. The report gave an update of the activities of the Centres of the Engineering Institute and the Institute Office to May 31, 1996.

With respect to the Continuing Engineering Education Centre (CEEC), the Engineering Institute's Manager reported that 25 courses were run during the year 1994 and forty-two were run from January 1995 to March 1996. The revenues were close to those budgeted and surpluses were used in the development of the Engineering Institute's office and the expansion of the Centre. The Manager noted that courses were run not only in the Faculty in Trinidad and Tobago, but also in several of the other territories, thereby demonstrating the regional vision of the

Institute. An Income and Expenditure statement was attached. This showed that income from the CEEC for the period August 1, 1994 to July 31, 1995 was \$1,002,338.24 and expenditure \$932,830.34.

Document 42

The Manager, Engineering Institute presented a status report to Faculty Board at its meeting in September 18, 1987. Among other matters, the Manager reported that the Engineering Institute Office coordinated the work of the seven centres within the Institute. In presenting a review of all the centres, the Manager reported that the Continuing Engineering Education Centre (CEEC) had played a key role in the establishment and support of the Institute. He stated further that CEEC was on a continuous growth path in its implementation of short courses, seminars, workshops and conferences. In 1995, thirty four programmes were conducted and for 1996 forty three short courses and three conferences were hosted by the CEEC. Surpluses from that centre were used in the development of the Engineering Institute Office, the Faculty and the expansion of the Centre.

The Manager also reported that approval was granted to include the **Centre for Geospacial Studies** into the ambit of the Engineering Institute.

Document 43

Faculty Board at its meeting on August 14, 1998 approved the appointment of Dr. C. A.C. Imbert as Deputy Dean, Undergraduate Affairs/Distance Education. In light of that appointment, the Board noted that a suitable new Chairman needed to be identified for Continuing Education.

Document 44

The Manager, Engineering Institute in his report to Faculty Board at its meeting on March 2, 2000 advised that the Board of Directors of the Institute had approved the changes to in the operating procedure for the Continuing Engineering Education Centre. Policy was put in place with respect to Training Courses, Credit Policy, Reduced Fees – staff and full-time students, programme budgets, division of course income and honoraria and fees.

The Manager also reported that a system for awarding academic credits for courses offered by the CEEC was not yet in place, “but that where appropriate, the courses could be used as Continuing Professional Development units (CDP) in the CDP programme for registered engineers.

APPENDIX 10

Summary of Documents Health Economics Unit

Document 1

Letter dated June 20, 1995 from Dr. Karl Theodore, University Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences to the Vice chancellor, Sir Alister Mc Intyre advising him that the Faculty was pleased to announce the formation of the Health Economics Unit within the Department of Economics. Dr. Theodore also informed the Vice chancellor that the:

“establishment of the Unit is consistent with the determination of the Faculty to adopt a more structural approach to the research and consultancy of its staff members. The new Unit also reflects the decision of the Department of Economics to establish a number of research clusters among its different staff members. The HE comprises at the moment three members of staff and is coordinated by me, in my capacity as the senior researchers in this area. In my own view, the HEU will be an efficient vehicle to consolidate teaching, research and policy support in the area of Health Economics... The aim is to make the UWI a centre of excellence in this area and to demonstrate in a tangible way the UWI’s commitment to improving the quality of policy implementation in the region.”

Document 2

Memorandum dated July 10, 1995 from Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences, Dr. Karl Theodore to Professor Georgiev, Department of Community Medicine informing him that the Department of Economics had recently agreed to the establishment of a Health Economics Unit. Dr. Theodore further advised Prof. Georgiev that the “Unit will seek to consolidate the work of the Department in this important area and will strive to establish and maintain a high quality of teaching, research and policy support. In order to carry out its work the Unit will need to collaborate with other teachers and researchers within the UWI, especially with the Faculty of Medicine”.

On behalf of the Faculty, the Dean invited Prof. Georgiev to support the establishment of the Unit and added that he looked forward, in his capacity as Coordinator of the Unit to working with him in the not too distance future.

Document 3

Statement of Account of the Health Economics Unit dated October 21, 1997 for the period August 1, 1997 to October 15, 1997 which was prepared and approved by officials of the Campus Bursary, UWI, St. Augustine. The statement showed a surplus of \$40,015.01.

Document 4

Letter dated December 16, 1997 from the Coordinator, Health Economics Unit (HEU) to the Campus Bursar seeking a temporary waiver of the common services fee/Administration that was being applied to the Health Economics Unit. He argued that “the HEU had been valiantly trying to bring in enough resources to cover its running costs and a waiver at this time will go a long way in keeping us out of the red.” He promised that “once the HEU found its legs.....we would be more than willing to contribute to the overall expenses of the university”.

Document 5

Letter dated January 6, 1998 from the Coordinator, Health Economics Unit (HEU) to the Campus Bursar re. a proposal on Common Service Fees. He advised the Bursar that the HEU had been invited by the Government of St. Vincent and the Grenadines to carry out a number of studies on the design of its proposed National Health Insurance Plan. The HEU had agreed to undertake the exercise at very modest rates of remuneration since the government would not be obtaining any external aid to carry out the studies and partly because “of our vision of the role of the UWI in the Caribbean”. The Coordinator was therefore requesting that the Bursary accept a fixed payment instead of a percentage of total expenses incurred. He ended his letter by stating that “for us this will be a gesture of support for the entrepreneurial efforts of the Unit as well as a sign of commitment of the UWI to the development of the region”.

Document 6

Letter dated January 19, 1998 from the Campus Bursary to the Coordinator, Health Economics Unit (HEU) in response to his letter re. a proposal on Common Service Fees. He advised the Coordinator that “a project of the quantum involved should normally be charged a twenty percent (20%) common service fee. However, because of the special circumstances identified, a charge of ten percent (10% will be applied).

Document 7

Letter dated February 17, 1998 from the Coordinator, Health Economics Unit to the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Health, St. Vincent and the Grenadines in which a revised budget was outlined. The Coordinator commented that “the result of these adjustments has brought the overall budget, including a contingency, to a level of US\$136,763. Of this amount, the figure US\$103,000 represents technical services and the figure US\$27,250 presents general expense. Short of compromising the quality of the work it does seem to us that these figures take us to the limits of feasibility

Document 8

Letter dated February 20, 1998 from the Administrator, Health Economics Unit to the Campus Bursar referring to the meeting with Dr. KT, Coordinator Health

Economics Unit on common services fees in connection with the St. Vincent and the Grenadines National Health Insurance Plan. A copy of the Letter sent to the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Health, St. Vincent and the Grenadines and the revised budget were enclosed.

Document 9

Memorandum dated March 18, 1998 from the Campus Bursar to the Coordinator, Health Economics Unit advising that he had “reviewed the budget and after taking account of the points raised in our discussion, agreed to a revised common services charge of US\$4263 made up as follows:

	US\$
2.5% of US\$103,000	2575
5% of (\$27,250 + \$6,513)	1688

	4263

The Bursar also brought to the Coordinator’s attention that the project envisaged the use of consultants for which rules 35-42 of the Rules for Academic and Senior Administrative Staff are relevant and that the rules should be closely followed.

Document 10

Letter dated May 22, 1998 from the Coordinator, Health Economics Unit to the Campus Bursar re. the common services fees for the St. Vincent and the Grenadines National Health Insurance Plan. The Coordinator acknowledged that the revised common services charge of US\$4263 was acceptable and thanked the Bursar for his kind consideration. The Coordinator also informed the Bursar that the first cheque in relation to the aforementioned project had been received and asked for a project account to be established.

Document 11

Memorandum dated June 16, 1998 from the Divisional Manager (Projects) to the Coordinator, Health Economics Unit advising of the account numbers for the St. Vincent and the Grenadines National Health Insurance Plan project.

Document 12

Letter dated February 9, 1998 from the Coordinator, Health Economics Unit (HEU) to the Campus Bursar requesting that a project account be set up for its seminar which was carded for March 27, 1998 entitled “Pension Reform in the English-speaking Caribbean: Lessons from the Experience of Chile and the Rest of Latin America”. He argued that “this is an effort to facilitate the disbursement and receipt of funds for the above mention “high profile” seminar.

Document 13

Letter dated February 18, 1998 from the Coordinator, Health Economics Unit (HEU) to the Campus Bursar advising him formally of the proposed seminar on Pension Reform. He further advised that the Minister of Social Development that agreed to open the seminar and that two keynote speakers had been invited – Professor Carmelo Mesa-Lago from the University of Pittsburgh and Dr. Ernesto Miranda, Manager of the Pension Fund Companies in Chile. The Coordinator also advised the Bursar that the HEU had been soliciting financial assistance from general quarters and had already been assured of US\$1500.00 from the Vice Chancellor. He was therefore requesting that monies collected to defray the expenses of the seminar be treated differently from the normal inflow to the HEU account.

Document 14

Memorandum dated February 19, 1998 from the Acting Accountant, Credit Management and Special Projects to the Coordinator, Health Economics Unit advising of the account numbers to be used with respect to the Pension Reform Seminar.

Document 15

Letter from the Coordinator, Health Economics Unit to the Campus Bursar which was received on March 13, 1998 asking that the attached cheque from Price Waterhouse valued at \$5000 towards the Pension Reform Seminar be deposited into the agreed account in the Bursary.

Document 16

Letter dated March 17, 1998 from the Coordinator, Health Economics Unit to the Campus Bursar asking that the attached cheque from Clico Investment Bank valued at \$1500 towards the Pension Reform Seminar be deposited into the agreed account in the Bursary.

Document 17

Letter dated March 17, 1998 from the Coordinator, Health Economics Unit to the Campus Bursar asking that the attached cheque from Guardian Life of the Caribbean valued at \$500.00 towards the Pension Reform Seminar be deposited into the agreed account in the Bursary.

Document 18

Letter dated March 17, 1998 from the Coordinator, Health Economics Unit to the Campus Bursar asking that the attached cheque from Ernst and Young valued at \$3000 towards the Pension Reform Seminar be deposited into the agreed account in the Bursary.

Document 19

Letter dated March 17, 1998 from the Coordinator, Health Economics Unit to the Campus Bursar asking that the attached cheque from Republic bank Trust and Asset Management Division valued at \$5000 towards the Pension Reform Seminar be deposited into the agreed account in the Bursary.

Document 20

Letter dated March 17, 1998 from the Coordinator, Health Economics Unit to the Campus Bursary asking that the attached cheque from Venture Credit Union valued at \$1000 towards the Pension Reform Seminar be deposited into the agreed account in the Bursary.

Document 21

Letter from the Coordinator, Health Economics Unit to the Campus Bursary which was received on March 23, 1998 asking that the attached cheque from Buck Consultant valued at \$1000 towards the Pension Reform Seminar be deposited into the agreed account in the Bursary.

Document 22

Letter dated March 17, 1998 from the Coordinator, Health Economics Unit to the Campus Bursar asking that the attached cheque from the Vice Chancellor of the University of the West Indies in the sum of US\$1500.00 towards the Pension Reform Seminar be deposited into the agreed account in the Bursary.

Document 23

Letter dated August 5, 1998 from the Coordinator, Health Economics Unit to the Project Clerk, Bursary requesting the payment of TT\$7,560.00 to Ms. ALF to cover per diem and accommodation expenses for twelve days in St. Vincent and the Grenadines from August 12th to August 23rd, 1998.

Document 24

Letter dated August 5, 1998 from the Coordinator, Health Economics Unit to the Project Clerk, Bursary requesting the payment of TT\$7,560.00 to Dr. AC to cover per diem and accommodation expenses for twelve days in St. Vincent and the Grenadines from August 12th to August 23rd, 1998.

Document 25

Letter dated November 10th, 1998 from the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Health & the Environment, Government of St. Vincent and the Grenadines to the Coordinator, Health Economics Unit (HEU). Enclosed with the letter was a draft

in the amount of US\$31,708.20 which represented payment for the delivery of the First Interim Report on the National Insurance Scheme.

Document 26

Letter dated November 13, 1998 from the Coordinator, Health Economics Unit to the Campus Bursar. Enclosed with the letter was the cheque for US\$31,708.20 from the Government of St. Vincent. The Coordinator asked that the amount be deposited in the St. Vincent and the Grenadines Project Account.

Document 27

A copy of a signed contract dated January 29, 1999 between the Inter-American Development Bank and the Health Economics Unit for a short term consultancy. The terms of reference was attached.

Document 28

Letter from the Coordinator, Health Economics Unit (HEU) dated February 23, 1999 to the Campus Bursar in which a cheque in the sum of TT\$31,499 was enclosed. The Sum represented 33% payment of the total amount upon acceptance and signing of a contract with the Inter-American Development Bank. The Coordinator asked for the amount to be deposited into the HEU's account.

Document 29

A copy of the Annual Report of the Health Economics Unit for the period August 1, 1999 to July 31, 2000. The report consisted of a list of research completed (4), research in progress(6), ongoing research (11) dissemination of research output (11) publications (8) and other activities (7).

Document 30

Memorandum dated May 22, 2001 from the Coordinator, Health Economics Unit (HEU) to the Accountant (Projects) on the financial position of the HEU. The Coordinator advised that the Health Economics Unit Account was in deficit by an estimated TT\$53,000. However, the unit had made arrangements for two transfers amounting to approximately TT\$44,000 to be made with immediate effect. He further advised that additionally the unit was expecting income from the diabetes project (2nd and 3rd tranches) amounting to US\$16,666 and from the CAREC project "Situational and Response Analysis of HIV/AIDS in Trinidad" the sum of US\$14,710. On the basis of the above, he asked that the Bursary approve the attached payments and those which the bursary was currently holding.

Document 31

Letter dated June 25, 2001 from Coordinator, Health Economics Unit to the Campus Bursar advising that he had been verbally informed that the

administrative staff members in the Health Economics Unit were not subjected to statutory deductions. However based on a recent newspaper advertisement he was requesting the Bursar's assistance in regularizing the arrangements for compulsory/government deductions to be made from the full time staff in the Health Economics Unit.

Document 32

Memorandum dated June 27, 2001 from Campus Bursar to Accountant (Projects) enquiring whether the persons named in the Coordinator's letter of June 25, 2001 held letters of appointment issued by the University or whether they were paid on an ad hoc basis.

Document 33

Letter dated July 5, 2001 from the Accountant (Projects) to the Campus Bursar advising that there was a myth that project staff were not deemed to be University's employees, but rather employees of the project (funded by a Sponsor). He advised that the legal entity was in fact the University of the West Indies. Unfortunately the HEU administrative staff were issued letter of employment by the Department and not the University. The Accountant advised that the Human Resource Department should address the matter and provide clear guidelines on "casual employees (e.g. personnel employed for stock count) as opposed to temporary staff employed on an on going basis".

Document 34

A copy of a proposal dated August 2000 for the consolidation of the Health Economics Unit (HEU). The consolidation context read in part:

"For the past six years the Health Economics Unit (HEU) has operated as a research cluster of the Department of Economics at St. Augustine. Although it was directed by a senior member of staff of the Department, to date none of its positions has been funded by the UWI. Project and grant funds provided the resources necessary for its work. given the extent to its activities in the region, and in particular, its recent work in the area of HIV/AIDS, it is now obvious that the HEU needs to be consolidated within the UWI structure if it is to continue making the contribution required by the region. One aspect of consolidation is obviously in respect of the tenure of the HEU's research and administrative positions. It will be impossible to hold on to quality human resources if only short term appointments are available. There is a clear need therefore to put the HEU on a different footing.

Document 35

Letter dated October 18, 2001 from Coordinator, Health Economics Unit (HEU) to the Senior Auditor, UWI, St. Augustine explaining the background to the HEU, Job Classification and Status of Selected Activities/Initiatives. He explained that the HEU started as one of five (5) clusters in the Department of Economics and operates with the status of a "project". "As such, the Unit/Project does not have

full time, long term staff. Instead, the services of individuals and organizations – including UWI staff – are sourced based on the existence of and needs of a given project.”

He continued that “given the nature of the Project/Unit, administrative requirements are generally kept to a minimum”.....”from the time of its inception in May 1995 the Unit has never been allocated office space....Arrangements have been made whereby the Unit has been allowed to access Prof KT’s office as required”. Because of the space constraint “there are a number of direct effects of the ‘invasion’ of Prof KT’s office space by the Unit. On the one hand, it has created a natural constraint on capacity: staffing, information storage including research information and administrative records. On the other hand, it has sometimes resulted in HEU affiliates having access to Prof’ KT’s personal/private information including his files pertaining to students and student matters”.

With respect to the status of the HEU activities/initiatives, Prof. KT advised that “the Unit does both funded and non-funded research including consultancies. In many cases, the preparation of a proposal is a forerunner to the start-up of a project. The following is a list of formant proposals and/or related initiatives i.e. projects materialized”.

Document 36

Memorandum dated March 4, 2002 from Coordinator, Health Economics Unit (HEU) to the Accountant (Projects) which gave a status report on the position of the HEU with respect to inflow of funds. The Coordinator indicated that based on projects in the pipeline the Unit was expecting an inflow of US\$70,000, US\$61,200 and US\$100,000. One the basis of the above, the Coordinator asked to be facilitated a bit further, “for at least another month”

Document 37

Memorandum dated September 11, 2002 from the Assistant Coordinator, Health Economics Unit to the Accountant (Projects) in which she indicated that the HEU was committed to reducing the current deficit of TT\$11,900 and that a deposit of TT\$15,000 would be made before the end of September. One the basis of the above, she asked that the Unit be facilitated a bit further with respect to expenses being incurred on the account.

Document 38

A copy of the Audit Report of the Health Economics Unit (HEU) which was part of the Management Audit Work Flow for the financial year 2001/2002. The findings and recommendations of the audit were submitted in the report.

The objectives of the audit were:

- (i) To assess the operation of the HEU and evaluate the system of internal controls

- (ii) To report on the adequacy of and compliance with University, Faculty and Department Policies and Procedures
- (iii) To analyse the inflows and outflows from the HEU accounts to ensure the completeness and accuracy of receipts recorded, and ascertain whether or not disbursements were properly authorized and verified.

Scope of the audit

The audit focused on the period 1997/1998 to 2000/2001. Reference was made to the year 1996/1997 and 2000/01 when applicable to present an up to date picture of the HEU activity. The 5 year review period was chosen as it served to identify brands and performance of the HEU over most of its existence.

Key recommendations

(1) Budgeting and Management of Cash Flows

Budgets should be prepared for all projects undertaken and should include a line item for contingencies, where possible. These budgets should be adhered to as far as possible and reworked if necessary to keep within the budgeted total. At the end of the project, actual expenditure should be matched against expected expenditure to ascertain the size of variance(s). This would assist in future budgeting and the determination of more realistic amounts for budgeting of future similar line items.

(2) Inadequate Organizational Structure

- (i) The HEU should approach the Dean to make a proposal to senior management for financial assistance in the form of an advance, to assist in the preparation of the proposals when the Unit is bidding for certain projects. This would enable the Unit to put forward more competitive bids. In the event that the HEU is unable to win the contract, the University may consider absorbing the cost. Otherwise the University would be repaid on the payments received when the job is secured.
- (ii) The HEU should put forward a proposal to the Dean on the staff that is required to manage the Unit properly.

(3) HEU Projects and Personal Projects

- (i) Personal outside work/consultancies being performed should be carried out in accordance with the Rules and Regulations governing consultancy work.
- (ii) Projects undertaken that are of a personal nature should not be filed with the HEU files. HEU stationery should not be used for personal projects.

(4) Office Space

Given the significance of the work being performed by the HEU and the impact this can have on the University as a whole, the Dean approach Senior Management to provide additional office space to the HEU in keeping with its needs, so that work can be carried out in more conducive surroundings.

Document 39

Memorandum dated December 2, 2003 from the Accountant (Projects) to the Coordinator, Health Economics (HEU) unit with respect to the payment of HEU administrative staff. The Accountant stated that requests for payment on a regular (monthly) basis was being made for member of staff and noted that although the Unit was self financing, it was under the auspices of the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine. He advised the Coordinator that all appointments must be made through the Human Resource Department and payment of salaries including the payment of statutory deductions would therefore be made in a systematic fashion. He further advised that the present system of payment by vouchers was not in compliance with the University's procedures on the payment of salaries. As well, it did not facilitate the processing of the above named statutory deductions, thus exposing the University to penalties and the possible tarnishing of its image.

Document 40

Memorandum dated December 10, 2003 from the Coordinator, Health Economics Unit to the Accountant (Projects) acknowledging receipt of memorandum dated December 2, 2003 re employment of staff on projects and promising to put things in place to comply with the University's procedures on the payment of salaries.

Document 41

Letter dated April 4, 2004 from the Assistant Secretary General, Human and Social Development, World Bank to the Campus Principal advising that the World Bank had approved a grant to the Pan Caribbean Partnership Against HIV/AIDS (PANCAP) and that that included a component for the Health Economics Unit (HEU). Since within the grant there was an allocation for the building and works of the HEU he asked that the architectural drawings for the relevant construction be fast tracked.

Document 42

Letter dated June 7, 2004 from Coordinator, Health Economics Unit (HEU) to the Accounting Assistant in the Projects Section, Bursary advising that with effect from June 1, 2004 all telephone payments for the direct line in the HEU office should be charged to the HEU's main account.

Document 43

Letter dated June 11, 2004 from Coordinator, Health Economics Unit (HEU) to the Campus Bursar asking for the regularization of the HEU Administrative/Clerical Staff for at least one year. However, he admitted that the requisite funds for the entire period was not yet in the account but he was asking the Bursary to facilitate the appointment of staff without ALL the funds being available.

Document 44

Letter dated March 13, 2006 from Permanent Secretary (PS), Ministry of Science, Technology and Tertiary Education to Coordinator, Health Economics Unit with respect to the provision of funding for the upgrade of the Health Economics Unit. The PS advised the Coordinator that Cabinet at its meeting on February 23, 2006 agreed to:

- (i) provide 50% of the annual recurrent cost for the fiscal year 2005/2006
- (ii) provide funding on an annual basis to meet the cost of recurrent expenditure of the Health Economics Unit in the Ministry's Estimates of Recurrent Expenditure
- (iii) provide funding to cover the shortfall in the capital cost of constructing and outfitting of the Regional Training Facility.

Document 45

Letter dated March 15, 2006 from the Coordinator, Health Economics Unit to the Campus Principal re the consolidation of the Health Economics Unit (HEU). The Coordinator advised the Principal of the provisions which were made by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago. He also advised the Principal that item (iii) in the letter from the Permanent Secretary would supplement funding already accessed from the World Bank.

Document 46

Letter dated March 22, 2006 from the Campus Principal to the Coordinator, Health Economics Unit acknowledging receipt of the Coordinators letter of March 15, 2006 re the consolidation of the Health Economics Unit and congratulating him on his ability to access funding from the Government.

Document 47

Letter dated May 17, 2006 from the Coordinator, Health Economics Unit (HEU) to the Vice Chancellor formally applying to have the Health Economics Units recognized as an autonomous entity for administrative purposes with the University of the West Indies. The Coordinator reiterated that the HEU was established in 1995 as one of the research clusters of the Department of Economics and that the clusters were expected to be self-financing, with no

dedicated administrative support or full time staff. However, the HEU had been operating as a University entity serving the needs of several government, regional and international agencies. The Coordinator advised the Vice Chancellor that based on the advice of the Campus Bursar, St. Augustine the preference was for the Government of T&T funds to be allocated to the HEU as a University Centre Project on the St. Augustine Campus, “where more than 15 such University Centre entities were already in operation.

Document 48

Letter dated May 26, 2006 from the Vice Chancellor to the Coordinator, Health Economics Unit acknowledging receipt of the Coordinator’s letter dated May 17, 2006 regarding the Health Economic Unit being converted to a Centre. He advised that given the support of the Government of Trinidad and Tobago he supported the request with great enthusiasm but asked to be assured that the leadership of the St. Augustine Campus was informed of the development. He added that he looked forward to the new Centre once approved by the F&GPC “becoming a major site for training research graduate students in health economics”.

Document 49

Memoranda dated September 12, 2007 from Coordinator, Health Economics Unit (HEU) to Assistant Registrars, Human Resources advising that the HEU would be unable to cover arrears for its project funded academic and administrative, technical and service staff since “the project/donors agencies under which the staff members worked made no provision for such payments and as such no arrears should be charged against the project accounts”.

Document 50

Memorandum dated January 30, 2008 from the University Registrar to the Campus Principal designate, St. Augustine, the Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences, the Coordinator, Health Economics Unit advising that Finance and General Purposes Committee (F&GPC) at its meeting on January 25, 2008 approved in principle the recommendation that the HEU be recognized as a semi-autonomous entity with established core staff and secure funding, pending confirmation from the Government of Trinidad and Tobago that it would cover the capital funding requirement of the Centre as well as the recurrent expenses.

APPENDIX 11

Analysis Table Faculty of Social Sciences Summer Programme

The analysis compares data from historical documents and interview source. These data are used to address the research questions (RQs).

RQ	Findings		Corroboration?	
	Documents	Interview [Line numbers]	Yes	No
1	Proposal 1992 [1, 3] Existing failing students but see [14]	Target audience = outside market [1-2, 12-14] but see docs.		X
	Proposal 1994 [18, 19] CPA, integration	Demand for courses [7-11]		X
	Estimated Budget 1992 [2, 5, 8, 9]	No cost to university [25-27]	X	
	Accounts [10, 25 (vi)]	Not in interview but originated with him	X	
	Staff contracts [11]	D advised by Sr. Acct.	X	
	Revenue surplus 1993 [14]	Scorn of the title “Summer Programme” and I remember telling him that one of the reasons we were using that name was that the North American students would understand the concept and there was a need to capture that market as well. [79-82] You see the notion of the thing was to make it acceptable, and understandable to people who were already taking part in that kind of exercise. I was using the language of the market at		X

RQ	Findings		Corroboration?	
	Documents	Interview [Line numbers]	Yes	No
		<p>that time.[87-90]</p> <p>The attractiveness, as well, as I said before was to bring people from outside the University into the University and we were able to do that. Failing students were by the way but in a way they ended up as one of the biggest catchment to the programme. [92-95]</p> <p>When I went to Academic Board it was not only for failing students. To tell you the truth it was not only for failing students. [100-101]</p>		<p>X</p> <p>X</p>
2	<p>Criteria for Admission [4]</p> <p>Concern at the non-inclusion of non-Faculty costs [5]</p> <p>Subject to the amendment of Faculty regulations or a proposal from the Faculty to UAC [6]</p> <p>Approved the estimates subject to adequate provision being made for maintenance and examination invigilation [8]</p> <p>The Deputy Dean (Student Matters) agreed to amend the budget in keeping with STAPEC directive [9]</p> <p>The Faculty was taking full</p>	<p>Interpretation – Substitute for Supps [16-18]</p> <p>It was vulgar – shut down the supps & now making money off the students [29-34]</p> <p>Colleagues – thought it was extra work & wanted money up front [40-41]</p> <p>Resistance from AR (Exam), SAR (Admissions) and Staff in the Dept. of Econ [48-55]</p> <p>Sabbotaging and Aggressiveness towards getting rid of the programme [62-66]</p> <p>The whole Library was</p>	<p>The two sets of data provided information that was relevant to the answering of Research Question 2</p>	

RQ	Findings		Corroboration?	
	Documents	Interview [Line numbers]	Yes	No
	<p>charge of the exercise as it had done the year before. [12]</p> <p>The Board directed the Faculty in consultation withto determine an appropriate registration status for non-UWI participants [13]</p> <p>Board further directed the Faculty to consider whether the passes could be used as credits for persons wishing to pursue degree/certificate programmes in the future [13]</p> <p>Sought clarification of Ms. F's status [15]</p> <p>Advised the Dean on Admissions matters [15]</p> <p>Visit by Ms F in connection with the 1994 Summer Programme [16]</p> <p>Comments and recommendations to Ms. F [16]</p> <p>Sought the Board's approval of amendment of Faculty Regulations for Specially Admitted and Occasional Students regularization of the status of Summer Students..... and automatic entry of Summer Students to the full time programme at Level II once they have completed ten Level 1</p>	<p>open therefore non Social Sciences Librarians were asking for money but overcame it with block grant [68-73]</p> <p>Resistance to change [75-77]</p> <p>Prejudice against backdoor entry [128-129]</p> <p>CPA Summer students were bona fide UWI students but the challenge was how to deal with them outside of the summer [145-150]</p> <p>Rules governing Summer Regulations [154-156]</p> <p>Personally no I don't let anybody intimidate me – People had a problem based on jealousy - the amount of money that was being made and challenged why we should keep that money [167-170]</p> <p>Cannot remember anybody threatening me or trying to intimidate me. People were obstructionist rather than intimidatory [179-181]</p> <p>It is a fad almost. In fact I think it is a dangerous fad. . . .So in a way the marketing was done for us by other means [185 – 188]</p>		

RQ	Findings		Corroboration?	
	Documents	Interview [Line numbers]	Yes	No
	<p>courses [17]</p> <p>There was disagreement on one policy issue which was to what extent the Summer School should be approved as institutionally integrated into the regular University operations [18]</p> <p>University Academic Committee agreed that the University Dean, F.S.S. should send the draft regulations to St. Augustine Faculties and to the Principals. [18]</p> <p>Transfer of funds from Summer Account to Library Reserve Account [26]</p> <p>Campus Librarian informed that a new account had been opened in which the FSS Summer money would be placed [27]</p> <p>Memo from AR (Exams) to the Dean (former Dep. Dean) reminding him of Examinations matters with respect to 1996 Summer Programme [28]</p> <p>Response from Dean to AR (Examinations) advising her that The Faculty will advise such students that they should seek prior approval from their Faculties before registering, if their intention is to have the</p>			

RQ	Findings		Corroboration?	
	Documents	Interview [Line numbers]	Yes	No
	Faculty of Social Sciences courses count for credit. The Faculty will not, however, make such approval a pre- requisite to registration in its courses. [29]			
3	<p>The Board directed the Faculty, in consultation withto determine an appropriate registration status for non-UWI participants [13]</p> <p>The Board further directed the Faculty whether the passes could be used as credits for persons wishing to pursue degree/certificate programmes in the future [13].</p> <p>Academic Board commended but noting that a Consultant's report on Summer Programmes questioned whether the time was opportune to proceed with the proposed changes in the regulations [17]</p> <p>The Board therefore agreed that the Faculty continue to offer Level I courses in the Summer Programmethat Levels II and III courses could be offered to qualified students for one year subject towith the prescribed examination regulations [17]</p>	<p>In the past there was a programme called Challenge Programme which used to open up in the islands to nearly anybody [130-131]</p> <p>The students who came in that programme were bona fide UWI students but you had the special statute that they [146-146]</p> <p>But what was eventually put in place was a set of rules regarding summer registration [153-154]</p> <p>What was good about that Programme was that the Government was not involved So people at any level could join the programme [203-204]</p>	The two sets of data provided information that was relevant to the answering of Research Question 3	

RQ	Findings		Corroboration?	
	Documents	Interview [Line numbers]	Yes	No
	<p>.... there was disagreement on one policy issue which was to what extent the Summer School should be approved as institutionally integrated into the regular University operations [18]</p> <p>Memo from HOD, Management Studies to staff in the department that expected Summer Programme funds was used to replace the carpet in lecture theatre and the possibility exist that Summer Funds will be used to cover the cost of splitting large classes. [20]</p> <p>Memo from Acting Dean (Deputy Dean) to the Campus Principal A procedure for appeal against Summer Programme Examination results. “The absence of appropriate regulations has been a major oversight on our part but as you know, the conditions of urgency under which the Summer Programme was introduced and continues to develop may often result in proper arrangements being put in place only on a piecemeal basis. It is also a fact that students (perhaps quite naturally) expected the same appeal procedure to apply and, in order not to make the Summer Programme appear as lacking in legitimacy, I do believe that the courtesy</p>			

RQ	Findings		Corroboration?	
	Documents	Interview [Line numbers]	Yes	No
	<p>should be extended to them” [21]</p> <p>Memo from HOD, Economics to the Bursar advising her of the Dept’s retreat . . . and advised that funds to cover the expenses should be taken from the Economics Depts proceeds from the Summer Programme [22]</p> <p>Letter from a Junior Research Fellow to the Dean, F.S.S. requesting financial assistant to attend the Salzburg Seminar.... Copy of payment voucher is shown [23]</p> <p>University Finance and General Purposes Committee Guidelines for fees and incomes for Summer Courses agreed that the bulk of the income earned through those offerings should accrue to the Faculties and to the Departments [24]</p> <p>Memo from Acting Campus Bursar to Acting Campus Principal offering suggested minor changes and comments on the Draft Memorandum of Understanding between the Bursary and the Faculty of Social Sciences [25]</p> <p>However, with particular reference to the point about “Students from Other</p>			

RQ	Findings		Corroboration?	
	Documents	Interview [Line numbers]	Yes	No
	Faculties” the Dean (formerly Deputy Dean) wrote in part: “the Faculty will advise such students that they should seek prior approval from their Faculties before registering if their intention is to have the Faculty of Social Sciences courses count for credit.[29]			
4.	<p>Memo from HOD, Management Studies to colleagues advising that at a meeting of HODs it was agreed that under the leadership of the Deputy Dean, the Faculty would develop a fullscale plan for rationalizing its Summer Programme. [20]</p> <p>However, with particular reference to the point about “Students from Other Faculties” the Dean (formerly Deputy Dean) wrote in part: “the Faculty will advise such students that they should seek prior approval from their Faculties before registering, if their intention is to have the Faculty of Social Sciences courses count for credit. The Faculty will not, however, make such approval a pre-requisite to registration in its courses. [29]</p>	<p>There was, like any other situation, anytime people see something new, the first thing they say is No, that cannot work because they like what they are accustomed to, they have a comfort zone, they don’t want to change.[75-77]</p> <p>When Humanities started their programme, they called it mid-year programme and I use to say “What the hell is that?” but you know this year I see them advertising Summer Programme in their Faculty which means that they are now following suit. [82-85]</p> <p>You see the notion of the thing was to make it acceptable and understandable to people who were already taking part in that kind of exercise. I was using the language of the market at that time. [87-90]</p>	<p>.</p> <p>The two sets of data provided information that was relevant to the answering of Research Question 4.</p>	

RQ	Findings		Corroboration?	
	Documents	Interview [Line numbers]	Yes	No
		<p>The attractiveness, as well, as I said before was to bring people from outside the University into the University and we were able to do that. [89-90]</p> <p>Challenge Programme – CD rose to the challenge, yet she encountered problems in gaining entry. Eventually I won because common sense prevailed and I was happy for that because she was the first, probably the only one to date who came straight from the Summer Programme and actually went on to do the Masters degree in Management Studies. [139-142]</p> <p>The students who came in that programme were bona fide UWI students but you had the special statute that they were Summer students. Something had to be worked out for instance so that they would not crowd up the place during the non summer months [146-149].</p> <p>Summer Programmes had spread to other Faculties but couldn't have the same level of success as ours mainly because the courses were not as in demand as ours</p>		

RQ	Findings		Corroboration?	
	Documents	Interview [Line numbers]	Yes	No
		<p>and I use to tell him that they should really try a new initiative and present the courses in a different way but they could never be as successful as we are and continue to be [159-163]</p> <p>Some people challenged why we should keep that money (the profits). I never had a problem with giving the University its due, I had a problem with them telling me how to spend the money. I toned down my language on that one when I started to understand a little bit about corporate governance but I certainly never toned down our right to retain a large amount of money because that was our initiative, our business, we could shut it down in the morning we wanted to and nobody could fault us for that. [167-175]</p> <p>Our courses are in demand because of what they are, especially the management courses. It is a fad almost. In fact I think it is a dangerous fad. It is a fad that you should do management since management will get you this, management will get you that. So in a way the marketing was</p>		

RQ	Findings		Corroboration?	
	Documents	Interview [Line numbers]	Yes	No
		<p>done for us by other means. [185-188]</p> <p>We use to have this standard ad in the papers once a year, during a particular period of the year, advising of the date on which the summer programme would begin and listing the courses to be offered in that given year but people were interested in this programme in their own right and I think people understood as well that it was a possible way of getting into the University. [192-196]</p> <p>What was good about the Programme was that the Government was not involved in it at all. So people at any level could join the programme. You did not have to wait to be chosen by the Government (who granted time off for attendees). You simply signed up and did it during the summer period. To tell you the truth we did not limit it to public servants [203-207]</p> <p>It did two things. It gave people a University qualification and it also gave people who did not have A levels a certification that would</p>		

RQ	Findings		Corroboration?	
	Documents	Interview [Line numbers]	Yes	No
		<p>allow them to come in to do a degree programme. [209-11]</p> <p>It was an alternative to A levels, a professional qualification that could be used and we did it with the same calendar time of two years- over three semesters.[212-214]</p>		

Notes:

Interview refers to the interview with the person associated with the programme from birth stage

Corroboration refers to similarities and/or differences in the information gathered from documents and the interview in the case

APPENDIX 12

Analysis Table Faculty of Humanities & Education Summer Programme

The analysis compares data from historical documents and the interview source within the case. These data are used to address the research questions (RQs)

RQ	Findings		Corroboration?	
	Documents	Interview [Line Numbers]	Yes	No
1	Query from Asst. Registrar (Admissions) Beginning of Summer Programme - 1998 [10]	To facilitate throughput and to give students an opportunity to recover before the next academic year [15-16]		
	Notification from co-ordinator of Linguistics courses to be offered in Summer 1998 [11]	I think I should also say too that we were a little jealous of the kinds of returns we saw coming to the Fac of Social Sciences who as far as I remember had pioneered the summer school operations and they had been providing themselves as it were with surpluses, operating surpluses which my Faculty did not have [17-20]		
	Academic Board approval in 2001 of 'cautious' expansion of FHE (mid year) summer programme [14]			
	Advertisement for 2001 (mid year) summer programme courses [15]			
	Self sustenance – expansion of programme in 2003, foreign students admitted	Started with volunteers from the department and the Faculty and an ancilliary initiative on the		

	<p>for the first time who will transfer credits [18</p> <p>Further expansion in 2004 27 courses offered [19]</p>	<p>part of part timers and post graduate students to offer the programme [25-26]</p> <p>I would say we saw it as a kind of experiment which we were doing virtually on our own so in a sense we did not expect full support and full support was not always forthcoming [109-111]</p> <p>Allocations went to the departments and facilitated expansion in terms of part time support within departments [115-117]</p> <p>Clientele of the FHE Summer Programme ...if you are a school teacher for example, you have more free time in the summer and our part time students tend to be from that group [150-153]</p> <p>It did provide additional resources for the faculty .. employing more part time assistance for the</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>regular staff during Semesters 1 & 2, we would buy equipment in particular computers because at that time the provision for computers were very, very limited.... We would utilize it for conferences. For example we would utilize the funds to send people to international conferences which supported overhand over what would normally be due to them. [154-161]</p> <p>Good impression ...it also gave the external community, i.e. external to the University the impression that the University's resources were fully deployed for most of the year and that we did not shut the place down here for a particular time in the year [162-164]</p> <p>Incentive</p> <p>The financial success enjoyed by Social Sciences has</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		always been an incentive and I suspect it still is. But it was even more important during that period where resources were stretched [201-203]		
2	<p>Minute 38 – Faculty Board meeting of November 2, 1993</p> <p>Views of the History Department</p> <p>“There was consensus that it was unreasonable to expect full time staff to teach Summer courses, in view of a greatly increased leading load, the greater expectations for research output as a condition of promotion, and the extreme difficulty in getting sabbatical or research leave at St. Augustine. Also, even if funds were available to pay part time staff (tutors, post graduates) to teach courses in the summer, full time staff would still have the responsibilities</p>	<p>In the early stages, we didn’t have participation from very many regular academics because they saw that, the summer programme, as encroaching upon the period they had for their own research and travel abroad ...although from the very beginning there was the understanding that you would be compensated additionally, many senior academics felt that compensation was inadequate, so many of them did not go into the programme [26-32]</p> <p>...resistance from the language teachers to go into the programme [32-33]</p> <p>My impression is that language courses have to</p>	X Docs 22 & 23	

	<p>during that period". [22]</p> <p>Views of the Department of Language and Linguistics</p> <p>"The Board noted that the Department had agreed that for reasons connected with the academic integrity of lecturers, as well as the question of assessment and promotions, it was essential for free time to be provided for research, and that such free time was diminishing as a result of the semester system" [23]</p>	<p>have a series of in course tests so that you move progressively from one point to the next. So they claim those cannot be taught in a short five or six week period [40-43]</p> <p>Resistance among senior staff...infringing upon free time and wasn't compensating them adequately [[52-54]</p> <p>It was cumbersome...we anticipated problems....and there were problems but not as acute as.....the distance education programmes which we were in charge of. [66-71]</p> <p>Problems but I would say they were minor ... But within two or three years of the start of our programme, things were resolved [71-75]</p> <p>I am sure that coming after Social Sciences did help in resolving some of the problems [76]</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>Strong resistance of the name “Summer” by Humanities Staff</p> <p>When the university through the Board for Undergraduate studies decided to officially confer the title “Summer School” there was resistance from us in particular here, we don’t have summer here and I must say some of our writer, creative writers who were members of my Faculty were the strongest in their resistance to the use of the term “Summer”. It was called the midyear programme initially until the University, the Board for Undergraduate Studies in its wisdom instructed that the word “Summer” would replace it. It was endorsed by the then Vice Chancellor, RN, who was seeing the summer school at UWI as a source of consideration attraction for</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		North American students.[181-189]		
3	<p>Recommendation to assign each Faculty a unique colour for the Summer programme registration form – to help proper financial recording [16]</p> <p>New policy implemented because of the proliferation of summer programmes – three part deposit slips [20]</p> <p>Overtime payment for staff at the Faculty of Education Library during Summer Programme [21]</p> <p>Campus Board minutes of February 6, 1996</p> <p>Academic Board agreed to the Campus Board's recommendation that registration in a summer programme must be with the approval of the Faculty in which the student was officially registered. [24]</p>	<p>I was a member of the Board for Undergraduate Studies and the Board had to consider amending the regulations but you see there was a loop hole already which said that you must spend at least two years in this institution. So these students would spend two years and two summers and that would be seen as the equivalent of the three years [89-92]</p>		

4	<p>Notification from co-ordinator of Linguistics courses to be offered in Summer 1998 [11]</p> <p>Notification from CLL Director of Foreign Language courses to be offered in summer 1999; also sought advice on fees to be charged [12]</p> <p>Notification from Coordinator or University English Language Courses of courses to be offered in the summer 1999 [13]</p> <p>Membership of Faculty Committees 1997/98</p> <p>Summer Programme Committee</p> <p>Dr. B Lalla – Chairperson Mrs. R. Pemberton – Dept. of History Dr. B. Hurst – School of Edu. Dr. V. Youssef – Dept. of Liberal Arts [25]</p>	<p>Leadership issues</p> <p>I know Social Sciences tended to have an office. We did not have an office until about two or three years ago. The programme was run out of the Dean's Office ... the single AA in the Faculty, Mrs. JA helped with the running of the programme out of the Dean's office [124-129]</p> <p>Leadership issues</p> <p>The responsibilities... shifted completely to the Office of the Deputy Dean (Distance Education and Outreach) and there has been a series of problems as a result of that... we have had problems with the payment for members of staff and it has led to certain members of staff pulling out completely from the summer programme.... If you have delivered a programme and</p>		
---	---	---	--	--

		you feel you have not been compensated it's unlikely that you would participate any further [192-200]		

Notes:

Interview refers to the interview with the person associated with the programme from birth stage.

Corroboration refers to similarities and/or differences in the information gathered from documents and the interview in the case

APPENDIX 13

Analysis Table Faculty of Science & Agriculture

The analysis compares data from historical documents and the interview source within the case. These data are used to address the research questions (RQs)

RQ	Findings		Corroboration?	
	Documents	Interview [Line Numbers]	Yes	No
1	<p>1993 – Start of Summer courses in the Fac. of Natural Sciences – Deputy Principal advised the Dean to prepare a budget for approval by STAPEC and F&GPC. [1,2, 3]</p> <p>The Bursary was asked to set up special accounts for the three departments involved in offering courses in 1994 [4]</p> <p>Copy of the notification of the 1994 Summer Programme which outlined the names of courses to be offered, the names of contact persons for each (secretarial staff in the respective departments), the limit of the number of courses per applicant (two), the cost per course and the closing date for applications. The notice also indicated</p>	<p>Programme started primarily as a recovery from failure, not driven by any economic persuasion but purely to improve failure rates especially at the Level 1 courses....it was not for students or offered to students for the first time but primarily for students who were repeating a course.....compared with Social Sciences, in direct contrast you could not just walk off the street and say you coming to do it for the very first time [1-18]</p> <p>....we have made some money from it and that money has helped to fund certain initiatives in the Faculty, like open day, our prizes functions, and send somebody to a conference or so, both academic and</p>	X Docs 1, 2 & 3	

that application forms were available from the respective departments in the Faculty. [5]	non academic staff, we are no way as successful economically as Social Sciences and the critical issue is the nature of the science courses....the lab component.....[38-42]		
Confirmation by the Bursary that separate accounts were opened [6]	...the department has to guarantee that even though the Faculty makes nothing, we must cover all the costs, so if hey want to do for less, fine, but we would not offer it for less than it can break even.[83-85]	X Docs 1, 2 & 3	
Memorandum advising the Assistant Registrar Student Affairs (Admissions) that the Faculty of Natural Sciences would be offering a summer programme in 1994 [7]	The money comes in very useful. We've done some major renovation. We've paid for conferences for some members of staff (if we want to send an extra person to ACHEA or something) some academic staff get funding from it, we fund our annual prizes function out of the summer and a number of other initiatives that come along. It has been successful financially.....no way in the area of Social Sciences but it has been financially successful. [272-278]		
Request for separate accounts (Mathematics and Computer Science) to be merged into one account [10]			
Notification by the Dean of 1997 summer programme – remedial teaching for failing Semester I and II courses. The Dean asked the Bursar to open one account for the School of Natural Sciences students and a separate account for the School of Agriculture [12]			
Notification from the Bursary that that there was a balance (profit) of \$28,198.50 at the			

<p>end of the 1997 programme. The Bursary advised that that balance would be carried forward to 1998. [17]</p> <p>Beginning of Long Vacation Teaching in the Faculty of Agriculture – 1988. All participants were registered Agriculture students who had sat and failed the course or were pre-empting courses [19]</p> <p>Academic Board agreed to recommend to University Academic Committee approval of the proposed Faculty of Agriculture long vacation programme on an experimental basis in 1988.[20]</p> <p>Request for the Registry and the Bursary to service the Programme [21]</p> <p>Memorandum from Bursary which included a statement of Income and Expenditure for the 1988 programme. It showed a surplus of \$1,800 after expenses had been paid. [22]</p> <p>Notification of the Faculty of Agriculture and</p>			
--	--	--	--

	Natural Sciences 1999 summer programme. [30]			
2	<p>Memorandum from the Ag. Dean of the Faculty to the Assistant Registrar (Examinations) in response to her memo. advising that he had held discussions with a representative of the Dept. of Maths. And Computer Science “which was remiss in not sending the list through the Faculty Office. He confirmed that the candidates were eligible to write the examinations. The Ag. Dean also commented that “it is quite clear that the way these summer courses are administered is far from satisfactory and that we need to put proper procedures in place to avoid confusion and error. [8]</p> <p>Request from the Assistant Registrar Student Affairs (Admissions) to the Dean to be informed of all the courses that were being offered in 1998 and the names of students who were accepted to read those</p>	<p>We had two dilemmas, we had Summer Programme but we also remained the only Faculty that still today carry a supplemental....So the Dean is trying to impress upon people that having supplementals is really counterproductive to running a summer programme.....He has had some resistance but change comes hard[21-36]</p> <p>And again unlike Social Sciences it is not easy to get science people who are going to teach. The human resource factor, because under the semester system lecturers were already quarrelling about how much they were doing....so they weren't interested in really coming back to do a summer full time commitment and you couldn't get a good core of people outside, as Social Sciences get for their programme[46-52]</p> <p>You also had the issue of lab space,</p>	X Doc 26	

	<p>courses. She ended “you will appreciate that in the Admissions Section we must have ALL information concerning students registered at this Campus” [15]</p> <p>Memo from Dean in which he apologized to the Assistant Registrar Student Affairs (Admissions) in which he apologize for the delay in forwarding the information. He enclosed the relevant information with respect to thee Faculty’s 1998 Summer Programme [16]</p> <p>Memorandum from Bursary which included a statement of Income and Expenditure for the 1989 Programme. After expenses a surplus of \$4,310 was realized. The total surplus for 1988 and 1989 then stood at \$6,110. The Bursary expressed concern about the level of fees charged the students advising that an average fee of \$525 each would have been more equitable and would have yielded a surplus of \$980. [23]</p> <p>Academic Board</p>	<p>paying lab demonstrators.....and people saying you making money in the summer, are you going to pay us privately or is it part of the issue [54-56]</p> <p>It is that much easier for Social Sciences, a student walks off the street and they have the basic requirement and they want to do a Social Science course, it is packaged easily, it can be modularized easily, not so with the Science courses. You have to have the qualification, you have to have people to do labs, demonstrators to carry on labs, the overhead is tremendous. [58-62]</p> <p>What was also happening we had issues of lecturers, a very mercenary approach to how they were asking for payment in a structured way in a way they never asked for it in the normal semester. So they documented preparation for a lecture, they documented marking of scripts, they documented everything they did....[75-78]</p>		
			X Doc 9	

	<p>retroactively approved the offering of Year 1,2 & 3 Agriculture courses during the summer of 1989 to those students who needed the courses either to proceed in the degree programmes or to graduate. The Board sought and received the assurance that University lecturers had taught the courses and therefore approved of the Faculty of Agriculture continuing its summer programme subject to the courses being taught by University appointed lecturers. [24]</p> <p>Cancellation of 1992 Summer Programme in the Faculty of Agriculture because students felt that the cost of the courses in the programme was too high which resulted in insufficient numbers to mount the programme. [25]</p> <p>Faculty Board noted one staff member's view that the whole issue of a Summer Programme was a disincentive to young staff as UWI placed greater emphasis on research</p>	<p>...the major thing with the administration is that we found that the summer programme is treated as a no man's land.....Nobody wanted to deal with it because they kept saying that this was unofficial, it was an extra job [88-94]</p> <p>Problems for the students – Because of the University calendar....the release of results, that time span between that and the beginning of the Summer Programme.....so that the registration was always jammed; students did not know, they couldn't actively plan[108-114]</p> <p>Taking of too many courses - exceeding the amount of credits allowed - ...but invariably there was no monitoring, so we had to set up internal monitoring with Social Sciences, not through admin. But a manual thing in that if my student wanted to do Social Sciences courses, they had to get a sign off from me first [123-126]</p>		
--	---	--	--	--

<p>and publications as against teaching activities [26]</p> <p>Request from Assistant Registrar, Student Affairs (Admissions) for the Dean, Fac. of Agriculture to provide a list of courses which the Faculty intended to offer in the summer of 1993/94. The Dean was also asked to state whether non-UWI registered students were being allowed to follow and sit examinations in the stated courses. [27]</p> <p>Request from Acting Dean, Faculty of Agriculture for the Assistant Registrar (Examinations to place back to its original date an examination for a particular course to allow the Faculty enough time to complete lectures as scheduled. [28]</p> <p>Memorandum from Assistant Registrar (Examinations) to the Coordinator, Summer Programme advising him of the new examination date and time for two courses. The AR (E) advised that she acceded to the request,</p>	<p>Cumbersome paper work became more because students who were doing Summer Programme required their course work to be carried forward and unlike now where they say it is automatic for a year.....Everybody wrote so you had a ton of paper.[151-154]</p> <p>Tracking Studentsso you needed to keep up with the student, sometimes you didn't see a student registered but they were still in the Faculty and doing a series of "summers" to finish their degrees. So it meant you were not seeing a registration but somebody will come and say I should have graduated since semester one, but because they not coming on a regular grid you could not pick them up. [158-162]</p> <p>So it created those kinds of loopholes, so they were able to fast track. A student could now finish his/her degree in literally two and a half years which is contrary to the regulations. We did not change the</p>	<p>X Doc 13</p>	
--	--	-------------------------	--

	<p>notwithstanding the regulation that “in no case any such change be made later than one week prior to the commencement of the series of examinations” [29]</p>	<p>regulations really. It was felt that you couldn’t stop a student, although initially we started to enforce it butthere was another regulation which said that a student will graduate when he satisfies the requirement for which he is declared so what are you going to do if he/she finishes early.[166-171]</p> <p>In admin, they did not even file summer programme forms. They just left them in a box, it was not put in the students’ files....who is suppose to sign off after the Bursary. So Deans signed off not Registry. [214-218]</p> <p>.....one of the issues that makes it difficult is that you are using the same staff and people are exhausted and because of the way you rate people, you need to do your research you need to have your publications and you need to do your teaching so where do you put that kind of activity. [301-304]</p>	X Doc 26	
3	UAC and F&GPC approved	I mean now they regulate the fees and		

	<p>guidelines for Fees and Incomes for Summer Courses/ Programmes</p> <p>Campus Registrar sent to Deans of Faculties a copy of the Guidelines for Fees and Incomes for Summer Courses/Programmes (8) which was approved by UAC and F&GPC in June 1995</p> <p>Guideline 1: Courses and programmes should generate financial surpluses i.e. an excess of revenues over costs. The underlying principles for pricing the courses and programmes should be (i) cost recovery and (ii) revenue generation [9]</p> <p>Approval by Academic Board of amendments to the Faculty Regulations because of the Summer Programme [11]</p> <p>Approval by BUS in May 1997 of “Regulations Governing the Summer Schools” after taking into account the comments and adjustments suggested by Academic Boards.</p>	<p>they have rules about how many credits but I think that that is driven by the banner system more so, the requirements of banner [101-103]</p> <p>...some of the issues again is about money and payment. Because in the early days when we didn't have any regulations it didn't clearly say when can a student be refunded, how can they be refunded? What portion they can be refunded? So the Faculties had to make rules as a go along.....a lot of time the Faculties made their rules as they went along because the administration did not take an active role, they didn't really want to take on more work....So a lot of the administration of the summer programme was really vested in the Faculty [133-149]</p> <p>You see Social Sciences Summer Programme had a great impact on our programme because of our regulations. So we saw a tremendous amount of Natural Sciences students do Social Sciences summer.[173-175]</p>	<p>X Doc 9</p> <p>X Doc 9</p>	
--	---	--	---------------------------------------	--

	<p>The secretary advised that the “regulations which become effective immediately” was attached for information and circulation [13]</p> <p>Notification from the Chair, BUS to Campus Registrars of the conduct of a review of Summer School programmes on the campuses. The aim was to determine whether there was equivalency in the quality of the provision between that of the Summer School courses and the same courses taught in either Semester 1 or 2. [18]</p>	<p>We write some regulations, Social Sciences started before us, so we looked at what Social Sciences had and we went with that. [205-207]</p> <p>....success of the programme is primarily that it has improved throughput rates. This Faculty, more so than Social Sciences, had a strong array of prerequisites and co-requisites....when we did summer we began to see that we really needed to review, what we had and to see whether co-requisites and all these things were necessary. It forced you to look at your rules to see if what you had before was really necessary It really improved the throughput rate [221-226]</p> <p>....one of the requirements that the Dean has always asked is that you need to indicate that you have the resources, somebody to teach it, who is going to teach it, who will be your demonstrators, your total proposal to be able to mount the course....the exam</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>paper has to go in and the examiner has to be on board. We ask for certain things because of the issue of quality. For some reason some people have a concept that the Summer is suppose to be easy, easier than Semesters 1 and 2 and we always try to mitigate against that. [230-239]</p> <p>Review of Summer Programme A total review will be done early next year (2008) of the Summer Programme and how it should go forward and the impact of stopping supplementals ...when we merged what presented itself was a lot of contradictory rules...Science only gave supplementals for first year students but Agriculture gave supplementals for first, second and third year and that had a lot of issues because we were one faculty but we had different rules for different parts of the Faculty [240-246]</p>		
4		<p>Unlike Social Sciences, the AA did it. The AA was primarily responsible for seeing about the Summer Programme[149-</p>		

		<p>150]</p> <p>Really we should have somebody who will manage the summer programme. It has always been a part of everything else that the AA was doing. [318-319]</p> <p>So there is a lot we can do, a lot, so there is scope but it takes somebody to direct people to lead to it and somebody to be responsible for it which will really be useful.....but there is scope, we probably will not be able to do it the way Social Sciences do theirs but there are things that you do that we have the infrastructure for but you have to have somebody and dedicate resources to develop it. [334-339]</p>		

Notes:

Interview refers to the interview with the person associated with the programme from birth stage

Corroboration refers to similarities and/or differences in the information gathered from documents and the interview in the case

APPENDIX 14

Analysis Table Continuing Engineering Education Centre

The analysis compares data from historical documents and the interview source. These data are used to address the research questions (RQs)

RQ	Findings		Corroboration?	
	Documents	Interview [Line Numbers]	Yes	No
1	Establishment of the Continuing Education Committee in 1973 [1]	In the 70s Dr. Myron Chin had started to mount continuing engineering education courses – short courses [1-2]	X Doc 1	
	Approval from the Board, Fac of Engineering for the Committee to mount 7 courses in 1973/74 [2]	There were just a few courses a year that he would organize and sometimes ask people to get involved and so on..... So I got involved and became a member of the committee. It was called the Continuing Education Committee of the Faculty of Engineering. [6-11]	X Docs 2 & 8	
	Approval for the mounting of 3 courses subject to definite guidelines “to ensure that the courses would not be mounted if it seemed likely that they would not be economically feasible [8]and in 1986 I took over as chairman of the Committee [11-12]	X Doc 29	
	Lecturer Imbert sought advice, support and assistance for a proposed seminar in light of uncertainties regarding short courses in the Faculty [18]	...we became very		

	<p>Request for advice from the Chairman with respect to Imbert's queries. [19]</p> <p>Approval to hold seminar subject to certain conditions including no financial loss to be incurred [20]</p> <p>Report from Imbert, Course Director on the success of the seminar based on the quality of the course content, the quality of the lecturer/presenters, the number of participants (56) and the healthy surplus realized. [23]</p> <p>1986 - Appointment of new Chairman of the Continuing Education Committee – C. Imbert [29]</p> <p>Agreement in principle to the establishment of a full-time Continuing Education Centre (to replace the Continuing Education Committee) [33]</p> <p>Expansion to overseas</p>	<p>profitable and I had to run a professional organization [28]</p> <p>...she became the first permanent member of staff, so she used to do everything, she would do the typing, she would do advertising, she would run the office [34-36]</p> <p>I had another person... she came on as our graphic artist to do all the brochures and so on. I did everything in house I wouldn't go to any printer or anything. I bought computers. Mac we were using in those days [38-42]</p> <p>And then we found that I had to hire more people, at one time I had four people [43-44]</p> <p>Innovativewe went from five courses for the first fifteen years of our existence and then we just shot up in about five, six years to fifty courses. That was a remarkable achievement in</p>		
--	---	---	--	--

X
Docs
41 &
42

	<p>operations - request for cheques [39]</p> <p>Request for additional staff – Training Co-ordinator (be paid by funds generated by the CEEC [40]</p>	<p>Trinidad and Tobago in continuing education by anybody, private or public. It had never been done before. We sought of led the way. That was that success, that we got a name, the Faculty got a name for doing this thing. We also made money [58-63]</p> <p>So then the Continuing Education Committee of the Faculty changed its name and we became a Centre. The fact is that this Institute would have Centres in different areas and we would be a Centre within the Institute so it is now the CEEC – Continuing Engineering Education Centre [85-88]</p> <p>Self Sustenance and helping others We used the money to do projects in Engineering. For instance the Engineering Institute was financed through the Continuing</p>	<p>X Doc 33</p> <p>X Doc 42</p>	
--	---	--	---	--

		<p>Education Centre [262-263]</p> <p>We bought equipment for the Faculty and that was OK once it was something for the Faculty. We would assist people with extra money to go on conferences [277-279]</p> <p>Entrepreneurship provided other benefits to UWI Contact with industry people helped accreditation [333-336]</p> <p>Engineers who came to the courses provided feedback on the quality of graduates and areas in which they thought more teaching could be done So we were getting this constant feedback which was even more valuable in terms of the amount of information that we would get in a formal meeting we would have once every semester or so or once every year and it was constant and it was good[350-353]</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

<p>to the decision of Academic Board that a Campus Central Committee would be established to oversee the management of short courses on the campus. The Board felt that such a committee would 'increase bureaucracy and would be counter-productive' The Board felt that guidelines for Faculties should be laid down instead [11]</p> <p>The seeking of clarification about the programme by the Campus Secretary (now called Registrar) [12]</p> <p>The provision of information on how the Continuing Education Committee carried out its affairs. The Assistant Dean (Continuing Education Research and Postgrad Affairs) also expressed surprise at the request since "this is the procedure which has been in operation with the Bursary for quite sometime now"</p>	<p>who supply the services and when I do to the Bursary they don't want to give me a cheque. But yet the Bursary insisted that all (incoming) cheques should be made to the University of the West Indies [210-214]</p> <p>Yeah, it meant we had no control over our money in a sense. So I just made a hundred thousand dollars. A hundred thousand dollars went into the Bursary over the last two weeks. I am now saying I have twenty thousand dollars for this person for food.....and they are telling me that they are only writing cheques once every two weeks. They have other priorities. No matter what you tell the Bursary; the Bursary is a very autocratic place when they ready I had the use of the money because there were rules about what the money could be used for. It was adhered to but the timing! [221-228]</p>	<p>X Docs 9 & 13</p>	
---	--	--------------------------------------	--

	<p>[13]</p> <p>Notification from the Campus Secretary that if the payment of \$50 per lecture included lecturers who were members of staff then that would be contrary to F&GPC decision [14]</p> <p>Non payment of lecturers due to violation of financial code [15]</p> <p>Appeal for waiver of F&GPC ruling to enable the payment to lecturers. [16]</p> <p>Admonishment from the Principal and the Vice Chancellor re. the breaking of the financial code. The VC authorized the payment but indicated that no further payment would be made until proper policy was put in place. [17]</p> <p>Approval to hold seminar subject to certain conditions including “no payment of any kind” to lecturers involved in the running of the</p>	<p>When is time to pay them (the caterers, the newspaper for ads) they calling me, when they call the Bursary and they ain’t get a cheque; it was real pressure and they can’t understand, they work well but they are bureaucrats, they can’t understand [234-237]</p> <p>Boy is just pulling my hair out and quarrelling with them. And you know they had the gaul to send down an internal auditor down to me. Because what would happen, if somebody came here, some engineer or something and he has a cheque, you think I would refuse that cheque and send him up to the Bursary. Next thing he is busy and he gone and he says I will do it tomorrow [239-245]</p> <p>But the real pressure was for those few years when the University was going through a crunch. My money use to go</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

<p>seminar [20]</p> <p>Dispute over the allocation of surplus funds [21]</p> <p>Decision by Bursar not to pay staff involved in teaching short courses pending the revised policy [22]</p> <p>Request from the Board, Fac. of Engineering for the Chairman, CEC to provide a detailed report on the affairs of the operations of the Committee. [28]</p> <p>Agreement with most of the recommendations of the Audit report by the CEEC but the expression of reservation by the Chairman with respect to the stipulation that all payments should be made directly to the Bursary. [35]</p> <p>Request for direct line to enable external calls to be made by officials of the CEEC due to the expanding nature of the operations of the Centre. [36]</p> <p>Request from the</p>	<p>into a hole and it can't come back out! And let me tell you that was extremely frustrating. [250-252]</p> <p>The major complaint that we got was about services. These are bit people, managers and so on of industries.....But here it was I was coming into the kind of competition that I did not have before. Because people saw that it was a viable thing [379-384]</p>		
---	---	--	--

	Chairman, CEEC to the Senior Accountant (Projects and Cash Management) for a cheque to be made out to the Trinidad Hilton to secure bookings for participants for an upcoming symposium [37]			
3	<p>Policy with respect to approval of requests for assistance from members of the Com. [5]</p> <p>Board, Fac. of Eng. agreed that a procedure should be put in place for the disbursement of funds from income accrued to the Com. [7]</p> <p>No more payments made to UWI lecturers for CEC work until a proper scheme duly authorized by the relevant bodies had been approved [17]</p> <p>Change in Policy - Disbanding of Campus Committee on Continuing Education [25]</p> <p>Recommendation from Board, Fac. of Eng. to STAPEC that</p>	<p>So the success of that encouraged the Faculty to establish an Institute that went beyond continuing engineering education, beyond short courses, seminars and workshops and conferences and so on [55-57]</p> <p>The four of us were keen to do this thing...TB, (who joined the University in the 1980s) very influential in the Petroleum industry, Mc Gaw as Dean, myself running this very successful programme and Dr. K. So the four of us decided together and presented a paper to the Faculty and the University to form an Institute of which the Continuing Education</p>	<p>X Doc 42</p> <p>X Doc 42</p>	

	<p>honoraria should be paid to all University teaching staff participating in Continuing Education courses. [26]</p> <p>Approval from F&GPC for the granting of honoraria for short courses/seminars in the Faculty of Engineering [27] [27]</p> <p>Board, Fac. of Eng. endorsed the recommendation of the CEC and agreed to recommend to F&GPC policy with respect to the apportioning of surplus funds [31]</p> <p>Agreement by F&GPC on policy with respect to the disbursement of the apportioning of surplus funds [32]</p> <p>Revised Guidelines for the Apportionment and Disbursement of surplus funds in lieu of honoraria for short courses/seminars conducted by CEC [34]</p> <p>Enhancement of servicing of CEEC</p>	Committee would be part. [81-85]		
--	--	----------------------------------	--	--

	<p>by Bursary [38]</p> <p>Evidence of the generation of income of over I million dollars by the CEC [41]</p> <p>Written confirmation that the CEEC had played a key role in the establishment and support of the Institute. Also the use of surpluses from CEEC for the development of Engineering Institute Office [42]</p> <p>Other Centres joined in [42]</p> <p>Approval or changes to the operations procedures of the CEEC.[44]</p>			
4	<p>Receipt of report from CEC for the period 1985/86 [30]</p> <p>1998 - Appointment of Imbert as Deputy Dean (Undergraduate Affairs/Distance Education) necessitating the need to identify a new Chairman of the CEEC. [43]</p>	<p>..I thought that just doing a few courses, five, six courses a year was not enough so I embarked on a strong marketing drive both within the University....(and) outside University So in about five years time... I quadrupled the courses from about six to about twenty and then after that we kept climbing [20-26]</p>	X Doc 29	

		<p>I had to run a professional organization so rather than secretaries doing things for five courses, we had paid staff and it was the first time the University had a unit which was not a project as such, which was a continuing operation [28-31]</p> <p>I asked for space and we got an office. Now I spent a lot of time on it, I mean I didn't ask for money or anything because I was building. [36-38]</p> <p>Then the work became so heavy as we started to grow, I had another person... she was more computer savvy... she came on as our graphic artist to do all the brochures and so on. I did everything in house[38-41]</p> <p>People used to tell me what you putting all this effort into this forIn a sense people did not understand that I wanted to do that and I felt a sense</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>of achievement. [118-127]</p> <p>When I left as Chairman we were turning over two million dollars a year and that was around ten years ago I suppose [137-138]</p> <p>I got to know all the people in the newspapers, from the Editors right downI would call and ask for favours, I would call and quarrel that you mock up meh ad, I want a free ad for that.[231-234]</p> <p>I would take the cheque and give him a receipt. The Bursary would say I can't do that, but I used to do it. They can't lock me up. I would then take these, make a note of it and deposit it up there. Then they realized they can't win me. They will say alright, you have to deposit every day. Me eh take them on. Me ain't having somebody go up there every day. It was real pressure. [245- 250]</p>	<p>X Doc 43</p> <p>X Doc 38</p>	
--	--	---	---	--

		<p>Persistence People wanted to know why I continued but you just have to continue [253-254]</p> <p>I used to have to broker deals nothing that any money was misappropriated or anything it was all in black and white and I was good at that and I was also good at bringing people in line. I could do that for the simple reason that I was fair, taking no money, the only money I would take was if I was lecturing in a course or if I co-ordinated a course like anybody else, but I took no money for running it, no fee nothing [308-316]</p> <p>Leadership Style I was a victim of my success.....But the feeling was Imbert now wants an empire, he wants to go to a hundred courses, because I was controlling the thing, I would make the decisions although there was a committee, my committee use to agree with</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>me.[393-404]</p> <p>As you know in any part of the world when you start something, especially when it goes against the grain you have to stick with it for a long time [418-419]</p> <p>I was also accused of being a dictator by people outside, which I was because the people allowed me to do what I wanted and I found it convenient [423-425]</p>		

Notes:

Interview refers to the interview with the person associated with the programme from birth stage

Corroboration refers to similarities and/or differences in the information gathered from documents and the interview in the case

APPENDIX 15

Analysis Table Health Economics Unit

The analysis compares data from historical documents and the interview source within the case. These data are used to address the research questions (RQs)

RQ	Findings		Corroboration?	
	Documents	Interview [Line Numbers]	Yes	No
1	<p>Establishment of the Health Economics Unit in 1995 [1,2]</p> <p>Surplus by the 2nd year of the operations of the HEU – August 1, 1997 to October 15, 1997 [3]</p> <p>Extent of the work undertaken by the HEU between August 1999 and July 31, 2000 [29]</p> <p>Explanation by the Coordinator of the background of the HEU, the circumstances under which the HEU operated and the type of work undertaken by the HEU [35]</p>	<p>....my sense was the health sector reform programmes (in the region) were not really working....and I thought that one of the reasons that it wasn't working was because some aspects of the programme seem to require a fair amount of technical analysis on issues.....I knew about it because different countries had approached me as an individual to give them some support on their programmes, but it became clear to me that this is not a one person thing. This is why the idea of the unit came.....So it grew out of a real need, a need that I saw. [2-38]</p> <p>....in particular the Minister of Health in Jamaica, he was very firm...he told</p>	X Docs 1 & 2	

		<p>them, Look we have a lot work to do here and we keep relying on people from outside but there are people from within the region that seem to be able to help us [25-28]</p> <p>And that is how it started, so we had done a piece of work as a team (in Jamaica) and then we came back to Trinidad and we formalized this team as a Unit. [70-72]</p> <p>I thought... well the idea that came to me I thought what I might do if the unit got project that could fund a part time lecturer then if the department would agree then I would say that person could teach at least one of my courses. I put it to the Head and he agreed, if we could find a person, and in fact we did....So in the early days what happened was that she took over teaching one of my courses but she was being paid by the Health Economics Unit, out of our funds. say .[79-88]</p> <p>The Vice Chancellor made it very clear that the University</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>didn't have funds to give us any posts so we had to find a way, we had to get projects to pay for...if we want to pay for our Research assistants, our Administrative Assistant... to pay for those things we had to find the funds for ourselves and that was a challenge, that was real challenging. [102-106]</p> <p>Factors that led to success? The good fit between the idea of the HEU and the need ... there was a need out there and we had the idea, so I think that fit between the idea and the need. [192-194]</p> <p>So there was a commitment to quality of the work, so the technical, the calibre of the people we had was really important but to me what also equally important was the attitude of the people. [198-200]</p> <p>Coming together of research and business ...we never lost sight of the fact that our primary purpose</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>was doing good research work...I mean I don't think we should ever lose site of the fact that we are not consulting firms, we are not consulting companies, we are research units that are doing technical work for people. [219-225]</p>		
2	<p>Request on December 16, 1997 for a waiver of the Common Services/Administration fee with the promise that "once the HEU found its legs.....we would be more than willing to contribute to the overall expenses of the university" [4]</p> <p>Request in May, 2001 to approve payment based on the expected inflow of funds - approximately US\$31,000 [30]</p> <p>Request in June 2001 for the Bursary's assistance in regularizing the arrangements for compulsory/government deductions from the salaries of full time administrative staff in the HEU [31]</p> <p>Query in June 2001 from the Bursar as to whether full time administrative staff in the HEU held letters of appointments issued by the University or</p>	<p>So I went to the VC and he said well he didn't have any objections sounds like a good idea. Then I asked him about support....Well that is a different question[13-15]</p> <p>O what helped us was at the time, in the mid 90s, DP who was not Head, had been suggesting to us that we should come up with a research agenda for the Department. So we kept discussing that but there was a kind of resistance from people....I told myself if we cannot agree on a research agenda what might be a good idea is if a few people in the department could agree to work in a certain area, so you might have clusters, research clusters.... If the department doesn't object we</p>		

<p>whether they were paid on an ad hoc basis [32]</p> <p>Confirmation in July 2001 by the Accountant Projects that unfortunately the HEU administrative staff held letter of appointments by the Department and not the University [33]</p> <p>Request dated March 4, 2002 from the Coordinator, HEU for the Accountant (Projects) to facilitate the Unit a bit further “for at least another month” based on the expected inflow of funds totaling US\$231,200 [36]</p> <p>Request dated September 11, 2002 from the Assistant Coordinator, HEU for the Unit to be facilitated a bit further with respect to expenses incurred on the basis that the HEU was committed to reducing the current deficit of TT\$11,900 with the expected deposit of TT\$15,000 [37]</p> <p>Audit report of the HEU by the Management Audit Unit of the UWI, St. Augustine for the period 1997/98 to 2000/01. Comments and recommendations with respect to the budgeting and management of cash flow, the inadequate</p>	<p>could set up a health cluster, a health economics cluster. They had no objections. [39-47]</p> <p>...they went with me and we spent eight weeks in Jamaica working on that project and the results were really very good, really, really very good....the IDB who funded the study....didn't want us to do it because they didn't know about us but the Government insisted that they knew us and said that we should do it. And the Government got the IDB to agree that if they allowed us to do it....they (would) circulate it to different people to get their views and so on. The Minister asked and I said I don't have a problem, they could send it wherever they want. When they send it and we got back the reviews, the reviews were so glowing, you know, these were young people I carried there and they did the work...then it hit me “that's my unit”. [56-65]</p> <p>When I came back</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>organizational structure, HEU projects versus personal projects and the limited office space were made by the Audit Unit [38]</p> <p>Notification dated December, 2 2003 to the Coordinator, HEU by the Accountant (Projects) that all appointments in the HEU must be made through the Human Resource Department so that payment of salaries including the payment of statutory deductions could be done in a systematic fashion. The Coordinator was also reminded that although the Unit was self financing it was under the auspices of the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine so that the system of payment by vouchers was not in compliance with the University's procedures on the payment of salaries [39]</p> <p>Acknowledgement by the Coordinator of the receipt of the memorandum from the Accountant (Projects) with the promise to put things in place to comply with the University's procedures on the payment of salaries [40]</p> <p>Request dated June 11, 2004 from the</p>	<p>to Trinidad, I told the Head, RH, these research clusters we have been talking about, I am going to set it up.... We are going to set up a thing called A Health Economics Unit...Is there an objection? The Department had no objection, they couldn't give any other support but they had no objection [65-70]</p> <p>...there were two kinds of concerns. (1) I was still a full time member of the Economics Department, carrying a full load of teaching. I tried to get a slightly lighter load because I indicated that I had this unit now but because of the demand of the department at the time, it wasn't possible so I had to... [76-79]</p> <p>And I keep telling people we don't forget that it was a result of cooperation by the Department which I never take for granted because the Head could have said no. He really could have said no. In fact one or two members of staff at the time felt that it</p>		
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>Coordinator HEU to the Campus Bursar to facilitate the regularization of HEU Administrative/Clerical Staff although the requisite funds for the entire period was not yet available [43]</p> <p>Response to the Assistant Registrars (Human Resources) by the Coordinator, HEU on September 12, 2007 that the HEU would be unable to cover salary arrears (backpay) for its project funded academic and administrative, technical and service staff since “the project/donors agencies under which the staff members worked made no provision for such payments” [49]</p>	<p>shouldn't happen because they were not sure who this person was. I said how could you be not sure who the head of research at the Central Bank is, the quality of that person....but the Head said no, no let it work like that and we went ahead. [88-95]</p> <p>The next concern that came up very early was the fact that if we were going to be a unit it would mean that we would have to find a way to get the people that are working for us to really. We can't wait until we get a project to call people....So we had to find a way to keep them and we were getting no funds from the University [98-102]</p> <p>...up to today the University has never given us any posts, support for the unit but from different sections of the university, the Head of our Department number one and then the Bursary, the Bursary really held our hands and there were times when it appeared that funds were not coming in at all and we had our</p>	<p>X Docs 4, 30 31, 36 37 & 43</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>research assistants to pay and they kept us going for a few months to see if something would happen and something always happened.....and we would pay off and so.... that worked very, very well. [107-114]</p> <p>We also knew that the way how the culture of the region is, I mean people tend not to want to pay you the kind of money that they pay others who come from outside...[120-122]</p> <p>...but one of the good things that happened to us was that in the early days the people we had, they didn't seem to have an attitude that the money was the important....they realized the work was important. But then we expanded our employment and pulled in more people....one young lady she had a different attitude. She really felt that the money thing, in fact her position was that it was our fault, that we really should have been charging more and she kept making this point and then I tell</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>myself but....and I thought if I kept her and she kept going on like that she would infect the rest of my staff.... [124-132]</p> <p>...in one case, what happened this young lady she just took a whole set of data we really burst our tail off to collect, she just hand it to somebody and I think because she was getting something gout of it. She was doing a private job for another agency and she just used our data...so we had to get rid of her. [138-143]</p> <p>Administration did not block the work of the HEU</p> <p>I think I had support (from the University administration), it was moral support and it was support in the sense of not putting up any bureaucratic obstacles in our way. We did not get support in the financial or human resource areas but they did not block us and that was all we needed....[151-154]</p> <p>Supportive and Committed Staff</p> <p>The HEU was quite</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>clearly a 24/7 unit. We had no hours of work. We had things to do and they had to be done and they had to be done by a certain time and that was it....and the HEU had like an extended family because it meant to say that there were times when my own wife would come in and put in some hours, some of the ladies sisters would come and they would help us and when I say helping us this is all two and three o'clock in the morning you are talking about to make sure that a project is delivered properly the next day...[200-207]</p> <p>Recognition that you could be blocked I know if people in UWI want to block you they could definitely do so, they could definitely block you and I realize that that did not happen to us at all. We didn't get block along the way and that I think was a stroke of luck...[211-214]</p> <p>Understanding from the top but unable to help the last VC, RN,</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>when I started losing people, I lost about four good people and I told him look you see this, we have to establish some posts because my people just keep going, because I can't hold them, I can't tell don't go because they are young bright people and they are getting nice opportunities, so we have to give them better tenure. I need some posts. He said the position hasn't changed. We don't have the funds [240-245]</p>		
3	<p>Proposal from Coordinator to the Bursar re the common service fee with respect to the St. Vincent and the Grenadines Project [5]</p> <p>Approval by the Campus Bursar of a charge of 10% common services fee instead of 20% for the St. Vincent and the Grenadines project [6]</p> <p>Notification by the Coordinator, HEU to the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Health, St. Vincent and the Grenadines of the revised budget [7]</p> <p>Letter from Coordinator, HEU to Bursar which recorded the meeting between the</p>	<p>And the VC, I must admit he quite liked the idea, because he suggested to me at the time, he said one of the things that could happen is that if we set up a unit like this then it means that the 15 Ministries of Health in the region ... we could ask them to start sending their people to spend some time with you and we could be strengthening, that could be our way of strengthening the region. It turns out, now is what 2007, we have an internship programme with the Ministries running now for about 4 years and that is</p>		

	<p>two parties re the common services fee for the St. Vincent and The Grenadines Project [8]</p> <p>Review by the Bursar, taking into account the points raised in the discussion between the Coordinator and himself, of the common services charge. A further reduction in the fee was suggested by the Bursar. The Bursar also drew the Coordinator's attention to rules 35-42 of the Rules for Academic and Senior Administrative Staff [9]</p> <p>Acceptance by the Coordinator of the Bursar's suggested figure of the common services fee for the St. Vincent and the Grenadines Project [10]</p> <p>Provision of account numbers by the Bursary for the St. Vincent and the Grenadines National Health Insurance Plan project [11]</p> <p>Request by the coordinator, HEU for the Bursar to provide a project account for the Pension Reform Seminar in Marcy, 1998. He argued that "this is an effort to facilitate the disbursement and receipt of funds for the</p>	<p>exactly what we are doing, we always have somebody here from a Ministry of Health.[30-37]</p> <p>Well, I always thought in some way the health economics unit was an invention. I don't think we had anything like this before so they didn't know how to deal with us and thank God they did not put any obstacles in our way. [146-148]</p> <p>Somehow they had heard about us and a whole set of requests from the IDB, from the World Bank, from PAHO and WHO....whoever was doing something in the region they really came to us so we did quite a lot of work for international and regional bodies and of course CARICOM itself when they needed that level of work. [158-162]</p> <p>...the single main success I think is that, I think all the Ministries of Health in the region now know that when it comes to certain kinds of work that they need to do that the HEU would be</p>	<p>X Docs 11,12 13, 14 & 26</p> <p>X Docs 27 & 41</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

	<p>above mentioned “high profile” seminar. [12]</p> <p>The Bursar received formal notification by the Coordinator, HEU of the Pension Reform Seminar, the fact that the Minister of Social Development had agreed to open the seminar, two key note speakers had been invited and that the HEU had been soliciting financial assistance from general quarters. The Coordinator also requested that monies collected to defray the expenses of the seminar be treated differently from the normal inflow to the HEU account. [13]</p> <p>Confirmation from the Bursary of the account numbers to be used with respect to the Pension Reform Seminar [14]</p> <p>Request for per diem for two staff members for a twelve day period in St. Vincent and the Grenadines [23, 24]</p> <p>Payment to the HEU for the first interim report on the National Insurance Scheme from the Ministry of Health & Environment, St. Vincent & the Grenadines [25]</p> <p>Request from the Coordinator, HEU for</p>	<p>the place to go to....I mean they just come to us so that sort of recognition as being the agency that deals with these matters for this region. [166-171]</p> <p>.... the fact that the unit in its own way I think with the University system, I think we groomed a number of young people, a lot of them have gone off to all kinds of agencies all over the world because what happens many times in addition to written work, there were presentations people made in different seminars or conferences; next thing you know calls came from agencies....the word spread that if you worked for us there was a very good chance after you worked for us you would get a good job somewhere else and I think what that mean was that a number of young bright people saw us as a place they would come to work for first, it would make for a good beginning. [173-182]</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>the Bursar to deposit cheque in the St. Vincent & Grenadines Project Account [26]</p> <p>Copy of signed contract dated January 29, 1999 between the Inter-American Development Bank (IADB) and the HEU for a short term consultancy [27]</p> <p>Request from the Coordinator, HEU for the Bursar to deposit into the HEU's Account a sum representing 33% payment re. the contract between the IADB and the HEU [28]</p>	<p>Recommended policy</p> <p>I think what the unit did.....these are the entities that could take the University of the West Indies into the backyards of the countries and help them out with specific problems.....I keep saying that in many ways the HEU model is the one that UWI should follow...you can't be just writing papers and sending them to get published, that is not the way you have to be engaged....So we are doing our research, but we also doing what is necessary to help the countries of this region to life themselves up and to solve their problems.[227-239]</p>		
4	<p>Receipt and requests for cheques received by the HEU to the deposited into the special account in the Bursar's response to the Coordinator's request for support from the University and the private sector for donations to offset the cost of the Pension Reform Seminar [15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22]</p> <p>Request from the</p>	<p>Identification of Need</p> <p>It came out of recognition that there was a need in the region that was not being served...But what helped it was the fact that because of a piece of work again that I had done, PAHO suggested to CARICOM that they should start inviting me to the annual</p>		

	<p>Coordinator, HEU for the consolidation of the HEU within the UWI structure [34]</p> <p>Approval by the World bank of a grant to the Pan Caribbean Partnership Against HIV/AIDS (PANCAP) which included a component for the Health Economics Unit for the construction of a building [41]</p> <p>Provision of funding from the Government of Trinidad and Tobago for the Health Economics Unit including the shortfall of the capital cost of constructing and outfitting of the Regional Training Facility [44]</p> <p>Notification by the Coordinator, HEU to the Campus Principal advising him of the provisions which were made by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago [45]</p> <p>Congratulations from the Campus Principal to the Coordinator, HEU on his ability to access funding from the Government of Trinidad and Tobago [46]</p> <p>Formal application to the Vice Chancellor by the Coordinator, HEU for the unit to be recognized as an</p>	<p>Health Ministers meetings.... I went to one, then the second one I carried somebody with me, somebody who was working with me and at these meetings we made presentations and I think a couple Ministers in the region got a sense that they had within the region the resources they probably needed... [15-25]</p> <p>Risk taker It turned out at the time it was only myself in that cluster but I did not have a problem I thought because by the time I had suggested the cluster I had identified about five graduate students, M.Sc. students who I had supervised and I had encouraged to do pieces of work on health and when the Jamaicans called us in 1995, called me to do some work for them I told them well look because of the nature of the work, you really would need a bigger team and so on and I asked them well, could I bring a team. They said do you have a team. I said yes, I have a team. Mind you my five</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>autonomous entity for administrative purposes within the UWI [47]</p> <p>Acknowledgement by the Vice Chancellor of the receipt of the Coordinator's request and the granting of his support based on the support of the Government of Trinidad and Tobago. [48]</p> <p>Approval in principle that the HEU be recognized as a semi-autonomous entity with established core staff secure funding pending confirmation by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago that it would cover the capital funding requirement of the Centre as well as the recurrent expenses [50]</p>	<p>graduate students never went anywhere before, they just graduated but I knew they were good so I took them to Jamaica with me...[47-55]</p> <p>Futuristic ...we going to set up a thing called A Health Economics Unit and I know exactly, myself alone as a staff member, but I am having these five graduate students working with me. [67-69]</p> <p>Granting of 5 Posts But he (the Vice Chancellor) made a suggestionyou are in Trinidad, talk to the Prime Minister..... just at that time....the Government had asked us to do the HIV AIDS response plan for the country and we did it and they got such good reviews on that plan and so on that they kind of knew about us so when I wrote my letter to the PM and I told him about the HEU he knew about the Unit, it took a while, I first wrote in 2003 and we got approval for the posts in 2005. [245-253]</p>	X Doc 44	
--	--	---	----------------	--

		<p>Persistent On top of that the HEU got funds from the World Bank to build a building for ourselvesto house our people but the World Bank money was not enough so I went back to the Government....could you give us the rest of the money to build the building and they agreed.[256-260]</p> <p>Unselfish Leaderships One of the posts that they gave us is the post of Director (of the HEU) but since I am heading the unit and I am part of the Department (Economics) that money we say we will use that money to bring in somebody else for the time being. [267-269]</p> <p>Passionate But it has been an interesting experience and I think personally, I think setting up the HEU and working with HEU made my life as an economist, a kind of fulfillment, it gave me the opportunity to do the kind of work that you really believe you should have</p>	<p>X Docs 41 & 44</p>	
--	--	---	--	--

		been doing all your life, to really make a difference for people.... You not only writing reports, you know you are helping them to change policy and to do the things differently and so on and that for me is personally very satisfying [270-277]		

RQ	Findings		Corroboration?	
	Documents	Interview [Line Numbers]	Yes	No
1	<p>Establishment of the Health Economics Unit in 1995 [1,2]</p> <p>Surplus by the 2nd year of the operations of the HEU – August 1, 1997 to October 15, 1997 [3]</p> <p>Extent of the work undertaken by the HEU between August 1999 and July 31, 2000 [29]</p> <p>Explanation by the Coordinator of the background of the HEU, the circumstances under which the HEU operated and the type of work undertaken by the HEU [35]</p>	<p>....my sense was the health sector reform programmes (in the region) were not really working....and I thought that one of the reasons that it wasn't working was because some aspects of the programme seem to require a fair amount of technical analysis on issues.....I knew about it because different countries had approached me as an individual to give them some support on their programmes, but it became clear to me that this is not a one person thing. This is why the idea of the unit came.....So it grew out of a real need, a need that I saw. [2-38]</p>	X Docs 1 & 2	

		<p>....in particular the Minister of Health in Jamaica, he was very firm...he told them, Look we have a lot work to do here and we keep relying on people from outside but there are people from within the region that seem to be able to help us [25-28]</p> <p>And that is how it started, so we had done a piece of work as a team (in Jamaica) and then we came back to Trinidad and we formalized this team as a Unit. [70-72]</p> <p>I thought... well the idea that came to me I thought what I might do if the unit got project that could fund a part time lecturer then if the department would agree then I would say that person could teach at least one of my courses. I put it to the Head and he agreed, if we could find a person, and in fact we did....So in the early days what happened was that she took over teaching one of my courses but she was being paid by the Health Economics Unit, out of our</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>funds. say .[79-88]</p> <p>The Vice Chancellor made it very clear that the University didn't have funds to give us any posts so we had to find a way, we had to get projects to pay for...if we want to pay for our Research assistants, our Administrative Assistant... to pay for those things we had to find the funds for ourselves and that was a challenge, that was real challenging. [102-106]</p> <p>Factors that led to success?</p> <p>The good fit between the idea of the HEU and the need ... there was a need out there and we had the idea, so I think that fit between the idea and the need. [192-194]</p> <p>So there was a commitment to quality of the work, so the technical, the calibre of the people we had was really important but to me what also equally important was the attitude of the people. [198-200]</p> <p>Coming together of</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>research and business</p> <p>...we never lost sight of the fact that our primary purpose was doing good research work...I mean I don't think we should ever lose sight of the fact that we are not consulting firms, we are not consulting companies, we are research units that are doing technical work for people. [219-225]</p>		
2	<p>Request on December 16, 1997 for a waiver of the Common Services/Administration fee with the promise that "once the HEU found its legs.....we would be more than willing to contribute to the overall expenses of the university" [4]</p> <p>Request in May, 2001 to approve payment based on the expected inflow of funds - approximately US\$31,000 [30]</p> <p>Request in June 2001 for the Bursary's assistance in regularizing the arrangements for compulsory/government deductions from the salaries of full time administrative staff in the HEU [31]</p> <p>Query in June 2001 from the Bursar as to</p>	<p>So I went to the VC and he said well he didn't have any objections sounds like a good idea. Then I asked him about support....Well that is a different question[13-15]</p> <p>O what helped us was at the time, in the mid 90s, DP who was not Head, had been suggesting to us that we should come up with a research agenda for the Department. So we kept discussing that but there was a kind of resistance from people....I told myself if we cannot agree on a research agenda what might be a good idea is if a few people in the department could agree to work in a</p>		

	<p>whether full time administrative staff in the HEU held letters of appointments issued by the University or whether they were paid on an ad hoc basis [32]</p> <p>Confirmation in July 2001 by the Accountant Projects that unfortunately the HEU administrative staff held letter of appointments by the Department and not the University [33]</p> <p>Request dated March 4, 2002 from the Coordinator, HEU for the Accountant (Projects) to facilitate the Unit a bit further “for at least another month” based on the expected inflow of funds totaling US\$231,200 [36]</p> <p>Request dated September 11, 2002 from the Assistant Coordinator, HEU for the Unit to be facilitated a bit further with respect to expenses incurred on the basis that the HEU was committed to reducing the current deficit of TT\$11,900 with the expected deposit of TT\$15,000 [37]</p> <p>Audit report of the HEU by the Management Audit Unit of the UWI, St. Augustine for the period 1997/98 to 2000/01. Comments</p>	<p>certain area, so you might have clusters, research clusters.... If the department doesn’t object we could set up a health cluster, a health economics cluster. They had no objections. [39-47]</p> <p>...they went with me and we spent eight weeks in Jamaica working on that project and the results were really very good, really, really very good....the IDB who funded the study....didn’t want us to do it because they didn’t know about us but the Government insisted that they knew us and said that we should do it. And the Government got the IDB to agree that if they allowed us to do it....they (would) circulate it to different people to get their views and so on. The Minister asked and I said I don’t have a problem, they could send it wherever they want. When they send it and we got back the reviews, the reviews were so glowing, you know, these were young people I carried there and they did the</p>		
--	---	---	--	--

	<p>and recommendations with respect to the budgeting and management of cash flow, the inadequate organizational structure, HEU projects versus personal projects and the limited office space were made by the Audit Unit [38]</p> <p>Notification dated December, 2 2003 to the Coordinator, HEU by the Accountant (Projects) that all appointments in the HEU must be made through the Human Resource Department so that payment of salaries including the payment of statutory deductions could be done in a systematic fashion. The Coordinator was also reminded that although the Unit was self financing it was under the auspices of the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine so that the system of payment by vouchers was not in compliance with the University's procedures on the payment of salaries [39]</p> <p>Acknowledgement by the Coordinator of the receipt of the memorandum from the Accountant (Projects) with the promise to put things in place to comply with the University's procedures</p>	<p>work...then it hit me "that's my unit". [56-65]</p> <p>When I came back to Trinidad, I told the Head, RH, these research clusters we have been talking about, I am going to set it up.... We are going to set up a thing called A Health Economics Unit...Is there an objection? The Department had no objection, they couldn't give any other support but they had no objection [65-70]</p> <p>...there were two kinds of concerns. (1) I was still a full time member of the Economics Department, carrying a full load of teaching. I tried to get a slightly lighter load because I indicated that I had this unit now but because of the demand of the department at the time, it wasn't possible so I had to... [76-79]</p> <p>And I keep telling people we don't forget that it was a result of cooperation by the Department which I never take for granted because the Head could have</p>		
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>on the payment of salaries [40]</p> <p>Request dated June 11, 2004 from the Coordinator HEU to the Campus Bursar to facilitate the regularization of HEU Administrative/Clerical Staff although the requisite funds for the entire period was not yet available [43]</p> <p>Response to the Assistant Registrars (Human Resources) by the Coordinator, HEU on September 12, 2007 that the HEU would be unable to cover salary arrears (backpay) for its project funded academic and administrative, technical and service staff since “the project/donors agencies under which the staff members worked made no provision for such payments” [49]</p>	<p>said no. He really could have said no. In fact one or two members of staff at the time felt that it shouldn’t happen because they were not sure who this person was. I said how could you be not sure who the head of research at the Central Bank is, the quality of that person....but the Head said no, no let it work like that and we went ahead. [88-95]</p> <p>The next concern that came up very early was the fact that if we were going to be a unit it would mean that we would have to find a way to get the people that are working for us to really. We can’t wait until we get a project to call people...So we had to find a way to keep them and we were getting no funds from the University [98-102]</p> <p>...up to today the University has never given us any posts, support for the unit but from different sections of the university, the Head of our Department number one and then the Bursary, the Bursary really held</p>	<p>X Docs 4, 30 31, 36 37 & 43</p>	
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>our hands and there were times when it appeared that funds were not coming in at all and we had our research assistants to pay and they kept us going for a few months to see if something would happen and something always happened.....and we would pay off and so.... that worked very, very well. [107-114]</p> <p>We also knew that the way how the culture of the region is, I mean people tend not to want to pay you the kind of money that they pay others who come from outside...[120-122]</p> <p>...but one of the good things that happened to us was that in the early days the people we had, they didn't seem to have an attitude that the money was the important....they realized the work was important. But then we expanded our employment and pulled in more people....one young lady she had a different attitude. She really felt that the money thing, in fact her position was that it was our fault,</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>that we really should have been charging more and she kept making this point and then I tell myself but....and I thought if I kept her and she kept going on like that she would infect the rest of my staff.... [124-132]</p> <p>...in one case, what happened this young lady she just took a whole set of data we really burst our tail off to collect, she just hand it to somebody and I think because she was getting something gout of it. She was doing a private job for another agency and she just used our data...so we had to get rid of her. [138-143]</p> <p>Administration did not block the work of the HEU</p> <p>I think I had support (from the University administration), it was moral support and it was support in the sense of not putting up any bureaucratic obstacles in our way. We did not get support in the financial or human resource areas but they did not block us and that was all we</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>needed....[151-154]</p> <p>Supportive and Committed Staff The HEU was quite clearly a 24/7 unit. We had no hours of work. We had things to do and they had to be done and they had to be done by a certain time and that was it....and the HEU had like an extended family because it meant to say that there were times when my own wife would come in and put in some hours, some of the ladies sisters would come and they would help us and when I say helping us this is all two and three o'clock in the morning you are talking about to make sure that a project is delivered properly the next day...[200-207]</p> <p>Recognition that you could be blocked I know if people in UWI want to block you they could definitely do so, they could definitely block you and I realize that that did not happen to us at all. We didn't get block along the way and that I think was a stroke of luck...[211-214]</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>Understanding from the top but unable to help</p> <p>....the last VC, RN, when I started losing people, I lost about four good people and I told him look you see this, we have to establish some posts because my people just keep going, because I can't hold them, I can't tell don't go because they are young bright people and they are getting nice opportunities, so we have to give them better tenure. I need some posts. He said the position hasn't changed. We don't have the funds [240-245]</p>		
3	<p>Proposal from Coordinator to the Bursar re the common service fee with respect to the St. Vincent and the Grenadines Project [5]</p> <p>Approval by the Campus Bursar of a charge of 10% common services fee instead of 20% for the St. Vincent and the Grenadines project [6]</p> <p>Notification by the Coordinator, HEU to the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Health, St. Vincent and the Grenadines of the revised budget [7]</p>	<p>And the VC, I must admit he quite liked the idea, because he suggested to me at the time, he said one of the things that could happen is that if we set up a unit like this then it means that the 15 Ministries of Health in the region ... we could ask them to start sending their people to spend some time with you and we could be strengthening, that could be our way of strengthening the region. It turns out, now is what 2007, we have an</p>		

	<p>Letter from Coordinator, HEU to Bursar which recorded the meeting between the two parties re the common services fee for the St. Vincent and The Grenadines Project [8]</p> <p>Review by the Bursar, taking into account the points raised in the discussion between the Coordinator and himself, of the common services charge. A further reduction in the fee was suggested by the Bursar. The Bursar also drew the Coordinator's attention to rules 35-42 of the Rules for Academic and Senior Administrative Staff [9]</p> <p>Acceptance by the Coordinator of the Bursar's suggested figure of the common services fee for the St. Vincent and the Grenadines Project [10]</p> <p>Provision of account numbers by the Bursary for the St. Vincent and the Grenadines National Health Insurance Plan project [11]</p> <p>Request by the coordinator, HEU for the Bursar to provide a project account for the Pension Reform Seminar in Marcy,</p>	<p>internship programme with the Ministries running now for about 4 years and that is exactly what we are doing, we always have somebody here from a Ministry of Health.[30-37]</p> <p>Well, I always thought in some way the health economics unit was an invention. I don't think we had anything like this before so they didn't know how to deal with us and thank God they did not put any obstacles in our way. [146-148]</p> <p>Somehow they had heard about us and a whole set of requests from the IDB, from the World Bank, from PAHO and WHO....whoever was doing something in the region they really came to us so we did quite a lot of work for international and regional bodies and of course CARICOM itself when they needed that level of work. [158-162]</p> <p>...the single main success I think is that, I think all the Ministries of Health in the region now</p>		
			X Docs 11,12 13, 14 & 26	
			X Docs 27 & 41	

	<p>1998. He argued that “this is an effort to facilitate the disbursement and receipt of funds for the above mentioned “high profile” seminar. [12]</p> <p>The Bursar received formal notification by the Coordinator, HEU of the Pension Reform Seminar, the fact that the Minister of Social Development had agreed to open the seminar, two key note speakers had been invited and that the HEU had been soliciting financial assistance from general quarters. The Coordinator also requested that monies collected to defray the expenses of the seminar be treated differently from the normal inflow to the HEU account. [13]</p> <p>Confirmation from the Bursary of the account numbers to be used with respect to the Pension Reform Seminar [14]</p> <p>Request for per diem for two staff members for a twelve day period in St. Vincent and the Grenadines [23, 24]</p> <p>Payment to the HEU for the first interim report on the National Insurance Scheme from the Ministry of Health & Environment, St.</p>	<p>know that when it comes to certain kinds of work that they need to do that the HEU would be the place to go to....I mean they just come to us so that sort of recognition as being the agency that deals with these matters for this region. [166-171]</p> <p>.... the fact that the unit in its own way I think with the University system, I think we groomed a number of young people, a lot of them have gone off to all kinds of agencies all over the world because what happens many times in addition to written work, there were presentations people made in different seminars or conferences; next thing you know calls came from agencies....the word spread that if you worked for us there was a very good chance after you worked for us you would get a good job somewhere else and I think what that mean was that a number of young bright people saw us as a place they would come to work for first, it would make for a good</p>		
--	---	---	--	--

	<p>Vincent & the Grenadines [25]</p> <p>Request from the Coordinator, HEU for the Bursar to deposit cheque in the St. Vincent & Grenadines Project Account [26]</p> <p>Copy of signed contract dated January 29, 1999 between the Inter-American Development Bank (IADB) and the HEU for a short term consultancy [27]</p> <p>Request from the Coordinator, HEU for the Bursar to deposit into the HEU's Account a sum representing 33% payment re. the contract between the IADB and the HEU [28]</p>	<p>beginning. [173-182]</p> <p>Recommended policy I think what the unit did.....these are the entities that could take the University of the West Indies into the backyards of the countries and help them out with specific problems.....I keep saying that in many ways the HEU model is the one that UWI should follow...you can't be just writing papers and sending them to get published, that is not the way you have to be engaged.....So we are doing our research, but we also doing what is necessary to help the countries of this region to life themselves up and to solve their problems.[227-239]</p>		
4	<p>Receipt and requests for cheques received by the HEU to the deposited into the special account in the Bursar's response to the Coordinator's request for support from the University and the private sector for donations to offset the cost of the Pension</p>	<p>Identification of Need It came out of recognition that there was a need in the region that was not being served...But what helped it was the fact that because of a piece of work again</p>		

	<p>Reform Seminar [15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22]</p> <p>Request from the Coordinator, HEU for the consolidation of the HEU within the UWI structure [34]</p> <p>Approval by the World bank of a grant to the Pan Caribbean Partnership Against HIV/AIDS (PANCAP) which included a component for the Health Economics Unit for the construction of a building [41]</p> <p>Provision of funding from the Government of Trinidad and Tobago for the Health Economics Unit including the shortfall of the capital cost of constructing and outfitting of the Regional Training Facility [44]</p> <p>Notification by the Coordinator, HEU to the Campus Principal advising him of the provisions which were made by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago [45]</p> <p>Congratulations from the Campus Principal to the Coordinator, HEU on his ability to access funding from the Government of Trinidad and Tobago [46]</p>	<p>that I had done, PAHO suggested to CARICOM that they should start inviting me to the annual Health Ministers meetings.... I went to one, then the second one I carried somebody with me, somebody who was working with me and at these meetings we made presentations and I think a couple Ministers in the region got a sense that they had within the region the resources they probably needed... [15-25]</p> <p>Risk taker It turned out at the time it was only myself in that cluster but I did not have a problem I thought because by the time I had suggested the cluster I had identified about five graduate students, M.Sc. students who I had supervised and I had encouraged to do pieces of work on health and when the Jamaicans called us in 1995, called me to do some work for them I told them well look because of the nature of the work, you really would need a bigger team and so on and I asked them well,</p>		
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>Formal application to the Vice Chancellor by the Coordinator, HEU for the unit to be recognized as an autonomous entity for administrative purposes within the UWI [47]</p> <p>Acknowledgement by the Vice Chancellor of the receipt of the Coordinator's request and the granting of his support based on the support of the Government of Trinidad and Tobago. [48]</p> <p>Approval in principle that the HEU be recognized as a semi-autonomous entity with established core staff secure funding pending confirmation by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago that it would cover the capital funding requirement of the Centre as well as the recurrent expenses [50]</p>	<p>could I bring a team. They said do you have a team. I said yes, I have a team. Mind you my five graduate students never went anywhere before, they just graduated but I knew they were good so I took them to Jamaica with me...[47-55]</p> <p>Futuristic ...we going to set up a thing called A Health Economics Unit and I know exactly, myself alone as a staff member, but I am having these five graduate students working with me. [67-69]</p> <p>Granting of 5 Posts But he (the Vice Chancellor) made a suggestionyou are in Trinidad, talk to the Prime Minister..... just at that time....the Government had asked us to do the HIV AIDS response plan for the country and we did it and they got such good reviews on that plan and so on that they kind of knew about us so when I wrote my letter to the PM and I told him about the HEU he knew about the Unit, it took a while, I first</p>	X Doc 44	
--	--	--	----------------	--

		<p>wrote in 2003 and we got approval for the posts in 2005. [245-253]</p> <p>Persistent On top of that the HEU got funds from the World Bank to build a building for ourselvesto house our people but the World Bank money was not enough so I went back to the Government....could you give us the rest of the money to build the building and they agreed.[256-260]</p> <p>Unselfish Leaderships One of the posts that they gave us is the post of Director (of the HEU) but since I am heading the unit and I am part of the Department (Economics) that money we say we will use that money to bring in somebody else for the time being. [267-269]</p> <p>Passionate But it has been an interesting experience and I think personally, I think setting up the HEU and working with HEU made my life as an economist, a kind of fulfillment,</p>	<p>X Docs 41 & 44</p>	
--	--	--	---------------------------------------	--

		it gave me the opportunity to do the kind of work that you really believe you should have been doing all your life, to really make a difference for people.... You not only writing reports, you know you are helping them to change policy and to do the things differently and so on and that for me is personally very satisfying [270-277]		

Notes:

Interview refers to the interview with the person associated with the programme from birth stage.

Corroboration refers to similarities and/or differences in the information gathered from documents and the interview in the case